CANADIAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

A Quarterly of Christian Thought

Vol. V, No. 4 October, 1959

EDITORIAL

A Plea for Expository Preaching — W.B. 219

ARTICLES

The Biblical Understanding of Community and Person — Roger Mehl 221

Christianity and Cosmology — David W. Hay 231

The Doctrine of God — Pieter De Jong 242

Theological Education in British Columbia — F. A. Peake 251

Soul Care in the Ministry of Jesus (I) — George Johnston 263

The Universities and Religious Studies — John S. Conway 269

BOOK REVIEWS

Edgar Newgass: *An Outline of Anglo-American Bible History* — Kenneth G. McMillan 273

Helmut Thielicke: *Between God and Satan* — L. De Groot 274

Paul J. Alexander: *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople* — John Gordon Rowe 276

John Norton: *The Answer to the Whole Set of Questions of the Celebrated Mr. William Apollonius . . .* Trans. by D. Horton — W. Stanford Reid 277

John Locke: *The Reasonableness of Christianity* — Louis J. Shein 279

T. H. Croxall: *Kierkegaard: Johannes Climacus* — Emil L. Fackenheim 281

Frederick Denison Maurice: *The Kingdom of Christ* — Graham Cotter 283

W. D. Geoghegan: *Platonism in Recent Religious Thought* — D. Gallop 284

A. Victor Murray: *The State and the Church in a Free Society* — H. H. Walsh 286

Charles C. West: *Communism and the Theologians* — Donald V. Wade 287

Charles S. Braden: *Christian Science Today: Power, Policy, Practice* — J. Line 290

J. M. Yinger: *Religion, Society and the Individual* — O. Hall 290

Samuel R. Laycock: *Pastoral Counselling for Mental Health* — Frank Lawson 291

H. Hutchison: *Why Baptize Infants?* — Mariano Di Gangi 292

CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Roger Mehl, is a Professor in the Protestant Faculty of Theology in the University of Strasbourg and Editor-in-Chief of "Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses." Author of "La Condition du Philosophe Chrétien," he contributes to many European periodicals and learned journals.

The Rev. David W. Hay, m.a., d.d., is Professor of Systematic Theology in Knox College, Toronto, Ont.

The Rev. Pieter de Jong, b.a., s.t.m., th.d., is Professor of Systematic Theology and Christian Ethics in St. Andrew's College, Saskatoon, Sask.

The Rev. F. A. Peake, m.a., b.d., is Director of Religious Education, Diocese of Huron, and is author of the recently published volume, *The Anglican Church in British Columbia.*

The Rev. George Johnston, m.a., b.d., ph.d., is Professor of New Testament Language and Literature in the Faculty of Divinity, McGill University, Montreal, and Principal of United Theological College, Montreal.

John S. Conway, m.a., ph.d., is Assistant Professor of History in The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C.

We invite contributions, which should be addressed to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee. MSS should be typewritten, double spaced, and proof-read before being submitted. Notes should be gathered at the end of articles, with appropriate references. No MS will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

The Journal is recognized as a charitable organization for Canadian income tax purposes. Financial contributions, other than the amount paid for subscription, may be deducted from the donor's income, when calculating tax. Donations are urgently needed if the price of the Journal is to be kept within the means of all subscribers.

Business Correspondence should be sent to Mrs. G. K. Montizambert, Secretary of the Board of Directors, Appleby College, Oakville. Cheques in connection with the business of the Journal (except for subscriptions) should be made out to The Canadian Journal of Theology, Incorporated, payable at par in Toronto.

Subscriptions should be sent to the University of Toronto Press, Toronto 5. Cheques in payment of subscriptions should be made out to University of Toronto Press, payable at par in Toronto.

Subscription Rates

Regular		*Students*	
One Year	$3.00	One Year	$1.50
Two Years	$5.00	Two Years	$3.00

Single issues $1.00

Editorial

A PLEA FOR EXPOSITORY PREACHING

During the last twenty-five years there has been a subtle change in the preacher's attitude to the Bible and partly for that reason expository preaching is out of fashion. Popular preaching seems now to be based on a psychologized theology—spiritual pabulum for the tender-minded and self-centered. This is perhaps even worse than the former way of approaching the Bible in which the emphasis was on the literal inerrancy of the Word of God. For what the best preachers in that style really meant was that the Bible was the Word of God and that it spoke to men of the will of God. To them the Bible was infallible not in the sense of literal inerrancy but because it was the meeting place of God and man. Once there was a common background in the interpretation of the Bible. Today we have not yet recovered from the repercussions of the critical approach, which continues both to inspire us with new insights and to disturb us with new problems. Modern biblical criticism has made the Bible a living Book for many of us, but we have not yet been able to put up a framework as solid as that of our fathers. For this reason there are many preachers who are diffident about expository preaching and uncertain in their approach to many parts of the Bible. The tendency of many preachers to confine themselves to topical or so called "Life Situation" preaching as distinct from biblical is perhaps due not only to the praiseworthy desire to keep themselves in touch with their people, but also in some cases to a compulsion to put honesty before certainty. It may, however, arise primarily from mental laziness and the fear of disturbing those who are set in their spiritual ways.

Yet, it seems to us that biblical and expository preaching is the only kind of preaching worthy of being called Christian. There is surely only one kind of sermon—that which has the Bible as its background. A man is not invited into a pulpit just to offer to the congregation his own reflections about life in general, but to proclaim to them the revelation of God in Christ, and the only basis of such preaching is the record of that revelation in the Bible. A sermon to be worthy of a place in public worship must, in the first instance, be an oblation to God on the part of the preacher whereby he offers to God the dedicated result of his wrestling with the Divine Word and his understanding of the Divine Will for his day as revealed in the Bible. Unless it is this it is an intrusion upon the act of worship. We must study the Bible itself. There is no substitute for such study—not of books about the Bible, but of the Bible itself. It speaks to our age as it has to every age of a God who is eternally alive in history redeeming men; a God who has done, is still doing, and is waiting to do marvellous things for his

children. Here is a way of escape from that pernicious subjectivity in preaching to which many are prone, based on flashes of insight and personal opinions, and which always stands in danger of becoming what Hugh T. Kerr has called "an intolerable impertinence, a breach of decorum in the House of God, an act of irreverent interference."

Evangelism we must have, but it is not enough. The evangelized need to be instructed in the Christian Faith. We have had too much exhortation and too little instruction. People are wearied of and bored by being exhorted, but the best of them are asking for teaching, especially young people. There is among them an awakened interest in the Bible. They want to know its content and understand its message; and they go to churches where they can get these things. The time is ripe for expository preaching. For too long the preacher has busied himself with elucidation of ethical principles, sociological ideas and current psychological theories, to the neglect of the Sacrament of the Word and the saving grace of "the foolishness of preaching." Preaching with a biblical basis is the clamant need of the hour both for the revitalizing of the life and witness of the Church and the spiritualizing of man's thought and conduct. Expository preaching provides a way of linking the study with the pulpit since it integrates private thought and public expression—often the bane of a minister's life. It also meets the needs of the people who are seeking instruction in the Christian Faith and corrects ignorance of the facts of Christian revelation. Furthermore, it shows how God works in concrete historical situations; that spiritual truth grows out of the very stuff of human life. This gives a much needed objectivity to preaching and saves the preacher from the temptation to feed his flock with side dishes of sanctified humanism which may delight but never satisfy.

W. B.

The Biblical Understanding of Community and Person

ROGER MEHL*

THE dialectic of the part and the whole is inadequate to do justice to the situation of man in relation to the community. This way of thinking distorts at one and the same time both the personality of man and the collective "personality" of society. Any account of the relationship between the individual and society must preserve these two "personalities." The mass, by its very nature, destroys them both; it is essentially anonymous and featureless, stifling all inter-personal relationships by standardizing them. It exercises over the individual consciousness an extremely strong pressure without encouraging a fusion of consciousness in a "we" capable of self-determination towards recognized ends. It does not succeed in creating an awareness of the values which can serve as a means of personal communication between them. It can only bring them under the influence of emotional currents in which they are alienated from each other; it produces a kind of collective effervescence, followed by relapse. Individuals, for a moment forced together into a corporate whole, are left to themselves; the mass does not put an end to the solitude of the individual, who does not find in it any opportunity of transcending but only an occasion of forgetting himself. Is it possible to give a collectivity a personal significance, to make it a veritable "we," in which persons can recognize each other and find an opportunity to transcend the limits of their subjectivity without sinking into anonymity? Holy Scripture is unaware of the phenomenon of the mass, which is bound up with an industrial and urban civilization, a civilization goaded by the demands of technology and of efficiency, producing immense urban concentrations by destroying all the traditional frameworks of existence and by snatching man from small communities where he found a relative security and relative guarantees for the development of his personality. Can Holy Scripture, which is unaware of the sociological phenomena connected with industrial and urban concentration, give us positive and normative guidance in the search for a living and fruitful relationship between the community and the person? At first sight, one may well doubt it.

One is naturally tempted to turn one's attention first of all to the Old Testament. It gives us the history of a people who passed through different sociological stages in proceeding from nomadism to the semi-nomadic and then to the sedentary life, in which they adapted themselves to a civilization of cities and small towns. Let us be on our guard against thinking that a

*This article was translated from the French by R. F. Aldwinckle.

sociological study of the people of Israel and its evolution—a study already made by Antonin Causse under the significant title: *Du groupe éthnique à la communauté religieuse* (Paris, Alcan 1937)—must necessarily have for us normative significance, or even an illuminating value for our present situation. It would not, in any case, be sociologically more enlightening than the history of many other peoples. It is possible that a sociological study of the people of Israel would lead us quite simply to the frank conclusion of Wellhausen: "The wheel of history passes over the individual; it only remains for him to submit himself hopelessly to it. He must find his reward in the well-being of his people."[1] This statement would be valid for all forms of tribal organization. To be sure, in tracing the evolution of Israel, one might to a degree modify the verdict of Wellhausen. It is customary to distinguish two periods in the history of Israel: one prior to the prophets, a period of collectivism in which personality has little reality, and another inaugurated by the prophets in which the protest of the individual conscience makes itself heard against social conformity, the protest of justice against routine. Certainly, this scheme is only valid in the broad sense and many modifications must be introduced. But let us accept is as true. What does it teach us beyond what we have already learned from the sociology of Durkheim, namely, that the individual personality only escapes from social conformity when certain sociological conditions are combined, and that this personality, even in its autonomy and in its capacity for revolt against the social order, is a product of sociological evolution? It is certainly evident that we shall not find an answer to our question along the line of an historical and sociological analysis of the evolution of the people of Israel. It is only when we consider the history of the people of Israel in the light of the interpretation given by the biblical witnesses, through the divine plan which is expressed in it—it is only when we consider this history as it was lived and understood by a certain number of divinely chosen witnesses, that is to say, only when we consider it in the light of the notions of election and covenant, that it can assume for us a normative significance. This history, which has unfolded according to known sociological laws, has also a significance different from that described by those laws. It is the history of a relationship between God and the people he has elected and with whom he has concluded the covenants. It has been lived as such (or sometimes retrospectively interpreted as such) by a certain number of witnesses who might have been able to illumine this process of development for the common understanding. One his no right, even scientifically, to say that a mythological interpretation has thereby been superimposed upon the true history of Israel, for this interpretation is an organic part of that real history, and has modified its course. It has produced in a sociological context, otherwise analagous to that of other contemporary pagan peoples, certain insights which have guided the relationships of the nation and the individual towards a new polity. It is worth the trouble, not only to see in what respects the history of Israel resembles

1. J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und Judische Geschichte* (Second edition), 1914, p. 69.

from a sociological point of view that of neighbouring peoples, even if this resemblance constitutes a dominant factor, but also to seize the specific difference, the decisive difference, even if it cannot be precisely defined, which makes it possible for the people of Israel to give us quite new norms for the relationship between a group collectivity and a person. This specific and precious difference belongs precisely to the revelation made to certain witnesses who have been able in a certain measure to communicate it to the whole people. In short, it is not, as the biblical fundamentalist tends to believe, the history of the people of Israel, in its total unfolding and in all its sociological structures which is interesting and normative for us. It is this history as it is interpreted and lived as the history of a relationship with God, a relationship which is essentially expressed in the three categories of creation, election and covenant, and in the category of eschatology. By virtue of this lived interpretation of history, the Old Testament perceives first of all that the individual man has a singular dignity and consequently cannot be regarded simply as a social product, even if in fact the nomadic Israelite was nothing else. Such a man has a spiritual essence: he is not a mere product of nature. Doubtless he has the same origin as the animal. Like it, he is formed of the dust of the earth and his fate is no different. But what constitutes his specific character is his ability to stand before the Eternal, to hear the Eternal speak to him, to enter into relationship with God. Such a relationship is not one of physical parentage (which would lead us again into a substantialist and naturalistic anthropology) but a relationship freely established by God, a relationship on the one hand of dependence on man's part as a creature, and on the other of partnership inasmuch as man is the object of the Word of God and understands this Word. Fall and salvation are events which take place within the very heart of this relationship. This essence of man, which is a being-in-relationship, is expressed by the Old Testament in its juridical theology. One of the meanings of Old Testament legalism is to underline the truth that man actually exists only in a relation of obedience or of disobedience to a divine order. It is by virtue of this relationship alone that man is not conceived as a pure fragment of the social collectivity and is not crushed by it. Certainly the group has a primacy, as is attested by the general fact of collective responsibility. But in the very functioning of this collective responsibility the particular dignity of man is manifest. The whole family of Achan is destroyed because of the fault of one (Josh. 7:24). The iniquity of the fathers is visited upon the sons. (Exod. 20:5). There is even solidarity in reward: the righteous Noah saves his whole family (Gen. 7:1). The house of Obed Edom is blessed because he has given shelter to the ark (2 Sam. 6:11). The benefits of Yahweh are always granted to the whole people without account being taken of the character of the individual members. Yet, precisely because an individual has the power of being a blessing or a curse to the whole people, the individual is not without value in the eyes of God. According to Edmond Jacob whose account we are following in this treatment: "If an individual can

involve the whole group in his reprobation or his blessing, there is present something very different from the totalitarian conception whereby the individual is sacrificed to collective ends."[2]

The social anthropology of the Old Testament, so far as it is determined by the idea of a relationship between God and His people, between God and each member of His people, is as free from the characteristics of tribal collectivism as it is from those of modern individualism. That is why Old Testament scholars, and in particular H. Wheeler Robinson, have created the new concept of corporate personality, defined by the latter in the following way: "The whole group, composed of past and future members, can act as a single individual in and through the activity of any member whatsoever, conceived as a representative of the group."[3] Examples abound of this notion of corporate personality. Adam and Israel are presented to us as at the same time both individual persons and as types representing a whole race of people. Amos speaks to his contemporaries as if they had been actually present at the departure from Egypt. There is a true reciprocity between the group and the person: If Moab is mentioned, this and that Moabite are indicated. In the same way, the "I" of the Psalms represents both the author of the Psalm and the whole nation, and the servant of the Eternal is an ambivalent being, representing both a person and the people of Israel. Election and covenant concern the whole nation, but the order of God, or the law which constitutes both the content and the sign of this covenant, are addressed to each man and cannot be carried out except by each responsible individual. The people is called to prayer, but that means that each man prays.

The individual is therefore never conceived as a separate being, enclosed in his own solitude, a kind of atom. He is always thought of in solidarity with his people, and with his ancestral line. Apart from this solidarity he would have no authentic existence, not being a beneficiary of the promise and of the covenant. But this solidarity is in no way mechanical. It finds expression in a consciousness of personal responsibility. The people sin and turn away from God, but each man is called to repentance. In these conditions, the people is no longer an anonymous mass, or a simple juxtaposition of individuals; it is composed of persons, conscious of their solidarity and of their responsibilities. Nothing illustrates better this mutual relationship between the nation and the individual than the prayer of intercession. Consider Abraham's prayer in behalf of Sodom (Gen. 18:22–33). In this extraordinary account, various themes are intermingled. On the one hand is seen a sociological structure such as characterizes all primitive societies. Sin is collective. Punishment is collective. The just and the unjust will be punished. It is the theme of collective responsibility which suggests that the individual does not count. But at the same time, there is Abraham's protest

2. Edmond Jacob, *Theologie de l'Ancien Testament* (Neuchatel et Paris, 1957), p. 125.
3. H. Wheeler Robinson, "Wesen und Werden des Altentestamentes," B.Z.A.W., 66, 1936, p. 49.

against such a misunderstanding of personal responsibility. Such a proceeding would be contrary to the justice of God. "To slay the righteous with the wicked, and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Classical sociology will detect here a glimmer of individualism which it will hasten to explain as the result of the lateness of this writing, which retraces for us a long process of historical development. It is heard in quite another sociological context than the prophetic epoch in which it is supposed to have been written. The explanation no doubt is true, but it leaves on one side a third element, and doubtless the most important, for the redactor of the text. Abraham is in the presence of the Eternal, and thus in this personal encounter, he affirms his solidarity with the people of Sodom. He intercedes on its behalf, and God accepts this intercession. God can scarcely confuse Abraham with the people of Sodom. Moreover, God accepts this intercession by Abraham for Sodom, this solidarity of Abraham with Sodom, this kind of substitution of Abraham for Sodom, which is all the more remarkable seeing that doubtless the Sodomites do not belong to the same tribe as Abraham. As soon as a man is in relationship with God, as soon as he holds himself erect before the Eternal, the possibility of communication is opened up between him and others. Between a man and a whole people a kind of mutual relationship is established. In the measure that the people of Israel or its predecessors considered their life as a personal relationship with God and their existence as a kind of worship offered to Him, the opposition between the person and the group was effaced. The person and the collectivity had homogeneous and interchangeable personalities rooted in what we have called the idea of corporate personality.

The theological significance of this corporate personality is that God sees humanity as a single man. He has created humanity in Adam. He has not created a collection of individuals who are strangers to one another, but beings in the solidarity of a community, united by the bond of obedience and adoration, collectively receiving the promise and the blessing intended for each of them. The fact that men are divided, that man is compelled to defend himself against a persecuting group, or that he is forced like the prophet into opposition to it in order to make it hear the divine threat—all this is the consequence of sin, of the rupture of the bond with God. Ceasing to be a being-in-relation with God, man ceases also to be in relation with the community and with each member of that community. The community then ceases to be a community, and simply becomes an organization of power and therefore of oppression. It is precisely because God sees humanity as a single man and hopes for the re-establishing of its unity that he acts in favour of a man or a group of men whom he chooses, but for the benefit of the whole of humanity. He chooses Abraham and his posterity that they may be a blessing to all nations. He chooses Israel that she may be the teacher of all the nations. He chooses a remnant in Israel for the benefit of the whole of Israel. He chooses a servant for the advantage of all.

It is in this way that the perspectives of the New Testament are determined by those of the Old. As Oscar Cullman has shown, the Christ is situated on this line of history.[4] He is the servant of the Eternal, incarnate in a unique person. He is, in the history of the relationships of God and humanity, the final remnant of the remnant of Israel. But precisely in him, humanity is recapitulated, that is, he takes upon himself the whole of humanity and its sin. And in him also God acts for the benefit of the whole of humanity. That which happens to him happens for the salvation of all. The doctrine of substitution must be viewed from the Old Testament standpoint of the doctrine of corporate personality. Christ is the elect of God, the anointed of the Lord, but his election does not signify the abandonment by God of the rest of humanity, nor of Israel, as Paul demonstrated long ago (Rom. 9–11). On the contrary, in him all the nations are called. He is "the first born of the new creation." The work accomplished by God in Christ, the foundation of the church made possible by this work, bear witness to the fact that God calls all men and all nations to live with him in a new relation, in a covenant of grace, in a relation of confidence, of peace, of love, of service and of adoration. This new relationship with God makes possible and results in a new relationship of men to each other, a fraternity transcending all sociological differentiations, a victory over those differentiations which is symbolized and realized in the church, whose vocation it is to extend its sway to the uttermost limits of the world, thereby integrating the whole of humanity.

In order to illuminate the problem which concerns us, it is worthwhile to study the structure of the church, that new society of men reconciled to God and to each other. Our attention will first of all be claimed by the fact that in the community of the church the interpersonal relationships dominate the structure and the organization. It is not only a matter of empirical fact that the primitive church had a very fluid organization, which only developed in the light of concrete necessities (e.g. the institution of deacons), and that the charismatic element always dominated the institutional element. This fact expressed the essential nature of the church: a community gathered around the risen Lord. All those belong to the church who are bound by a relation of faith, at once confident and obedient, to Christ. One enters the church as a believer in Jesus Christ, receiving baptism in his name and the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38). For baptism and the gift of the Holy Spirit only confirm and make more definite this personal bond of faith with the Saviour. By baptism, we participate in his death and his resurrection (Rom. 6:3–11). One will note in particular that the significance of baptism is that it allows us to live with the Lord (v. 8) and to live for God in Jesus Christ (v. 11), and further that the role of the Holy Spirit is to allow the faithful man to live in communion with Christ, in spite of our present physical separation from him, during which the Holy Spirit is the precious comforter and witness in us of our new sonship to God (Rom. 8:16). The church is indeed a

4. Oscar Cullmann, *Christ et le Temps* (Neuchatel et Paris, 1947), p. 82.

body, but it is so not in virtue of the structure which leads its members into unity but of its relationship to Christ. It is in him that we form a body. This incorporation *en Christo* is effected by the establishment of a personal relation with him—a relation which affects our deepest dispositions and even the very nature of our feelings. This is why the Apostle Paul can say and say again: "Rejoice in the Lord." This vertical relation with Christ necessarily involves a horizontal projection, an analogous relationship to the brethren: "We who are members one of another" (Rom. 12:4b). The whole of the New Testament ethic derives from this new realization of solidarity and love in which the faithful find themselves by virtue of their entry into the body of Christ, a relation so intense that it can break down the walls of separation between individuals: "Rejoice with those who rejoice; weep with those that weep" (Rom. 12:15). One sees that in this particular society, the Church, the opposition between the group and the individual is wholly transcended. The human person in his essential liberty, which is the liberty of believing, is here of the first importance. However, the community is not reduced to a mere aggregate of persons, since they are united, beyond everything that separates them, in a single body which creates such a unity as to make it truly possible to speak of the church as of a single man, who grows towards perfection so far as the bond between each believer and the Lord is not broken. It is because of Christ and all the bonds of his help that the whole body "fitly joined together and compacted . . . according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love" (Ephes. 4:16).

There is here a perfect mutuality between the person and the community, even though all the members are not equivalent since there are the strong and the feeble, the noble and the ignoble members (1 Cor. 12:22ff.), a diversity of ministries but not of passive members. The whole of 1 Corinthians 12 presupposes that there are no members in the church who do not exercise a ministry, however humble it may be. This unity of the church, this unity in the church, are placed under the sign of the hope of the Kingdom. As soon as the Kingdom comes, they will be perfect, for God will be all in all. It is the omnipresence of the personal God in every individual which will form the unity of this community which is the Kingdom. It is this profound unity of the coming Kingdom that determines even in the present all the ethical activities of the church and of its faithful. As Bultmann has written concerning the Old Testament itself, the characteristic of the eschatological expectation and of the obedience required by the Kingdom is that the responsibility of the individual and that of the community are simply one, whereas in the diverse apocalyptic perspectives the individual alone bears the responsibility for his own salvation and bears only that responsibility.[5] This reciprocity of community and individual at the very heart of the church seems to us to be seriously distorted in Roman Catholic ecclesiology inasmuch as the essence of the church is defined, not

5. R. Bultmann, *Geshichte und Eschatologie* (Tübingen, 1957), p. 35.

by this reciprocity in Christ of the body and its members, but by the hierarchical structure. The Church ceases to exist when this structure is not realized. This is the source of all clericalism, of all oppression of conscience. Roman Catholicism has established a sociological order in the church and this explains the often reactionary and oppressive influence which it has exerted in the state. This evolution is fatal as soon as it interposes between the Lord and the faithful, sociological authorities, a network of canonical prescriptions, all the structures and symbols of a human society. Let us have no illusions: Protestantism is also exposed to this danger, which appears very clearly as soon as churches, particularly the Reformed, cease to be content to define the nature of the Church as the congregation of all those who hear the Word of God and receive the sacraments in conformity to the gospel—the Word and the sacraments being the modes of personal relation between Christ and the faithful—but wish to add a third mark of the church such as discipline. Certainly the whole church, being a sociological body, is in need of discipline, but it is of the first importance that discipline be confined to its proper function and not be regarded as a constitutive mark of the church.

The reciprocity of person and community in the church is best seen in the identity of final purpose which is set before the faithful and the church. Ethical and spiritual progress in secular society is characterized on the contrary by the dissociation of personal and collective goals. Between my destiny and that of the state there is a gulf. However devoted I may be to the civilizing work of the state, I cannot regard the ruin of that civilization as depriving me of my personal destiny any more than the survival of the state across the centuries can suppress the problem of my death and of my ultimate survival. The misfortunes of the state have their repercussions in my existence and involve it in grief, but the prosperity of the state does not console me for my personal sufferings.

The great spiritual achievement of Christianity since the breaking of the bond between religion and the state consists in the realization of an intimacy or subjectivity which does not in any way remove the destiny of the state from the area of personal concern, but enables the individual to exercise a kind of detachment in relation to it. Subjectivity has its own requirements and it cannot wait for the permission of the state before devoting itself to them. The error of Marxism is to distrust this achievement and to think that personal problems can await their solution until the realization of the classless society and the disappearance of the state in an era of abundance. On the contrary, by virtue of the common bond of goodness which unites us to Christ and to each of our brethren within the body of Christ which is the church, the end of man can no longer be conceived as independent of the historic goal of humanity recapitulated in the church under the authority of Christ. Salvation cannot be conceived as purely individual. It is also the salvation of the whole people of God. It is important that salvation should not be presented to us in the manner of the mystic, as a blessing, a contem-

plative enjoyment, but that this salvation should bear a communal character, namely that of the Kingdom of God. The whole apostolic activity of the church derives its proper significance from the fact that salvation is indissolubly a matter of both the nation and the person. The act of faith is the most personal act possible, but faith finds its seal in eucharistic integration in the community.

The community of the church is thus the community where the reciprocity of person and group clearly appears. It cannot become a mass without destroying its proper nature. It is saved from this fate by the personal character of the relationships which are established within it and which constitute its existence. It must not be distinct from the congregation which it forms around the Lord. Does it follow that it can be for our modern society a kind of archetype to be imitated? Such was no doubt the sociological thought of the Middle Ages which conceived civil society as a sort of prolongation of the church, which desired to impose upon the civil society church structures which no longer expressed the true nature of the church in the New Testament sense. This attempt is, properly speaking, the clericalism from which Protestant thought instinctively turns away. It accepts a normal secularization of the world. Where Christ is not explicitly acknowledged and where there is no faith in the Lord, it is vain to hope to set up forms of church order. Civil society is not a community gathered around a person: it is a collectivity organized around a certain type of civilization, that is to say, a system of abstract values expressed by juridical institutions which translate these values. Civil society is involved in other relationships than those required by the church. Civil society—particularly a nation—has a fundamentally institutional character that the church must not have. It will tend to order in a legal manner the relationships of individuals to the group (which will itself be symbolized by an abstract institution, the state), and the relationships of individuals among themselves, as well as those of the many social groups which constitute the close knit and complex network of relationships within a nation. It is precisely because of this institutional aspect of structured relations in certain types of civilization that the subjective life must preserve for itself a proper sphere and that the life of modern man often consists in the preservation of personal intimacy against the intervention of society. Here there is no reciprocity between the person and the community, but rather a search for an equilibrium between personal and social goals. If they often intermingle, they must not be confused with each other.

Does it follow that ecclesiology should have no connection with sociology? No, but one must be on guard against confusing them. The world is not the church. The positive role of ecclesiology appears to be as follows:

(a) First of all the church in a society like our own, necessarily and strongly collectivized, constitutes one of the refuges, if not the refuge, of the personal life. It is in the church that man becomes a person or is re-made as a person in a personal relationship with the Lord and the brethren, in order

to return stronger to the world where the emergence of the mass, bound up with technological structures, is always threatening.

(b) At the same time and for the same reason, the individual, so far as he thinks of himself egotistically as absolute and as an individual in revolt against the group, finds himself questioned, attacked and conquered by the new kind of community life exemplified in the church.

(c) The church by its life, by its preaching and in particular by the political function which it performs by means of this preaching, is a permanent protest against those massive and inhuman structures which make man lose his sense of social responsibility, against the destruction of smaller and more human communities, against the disorder which delivers the man without spiritual support to impulsive forces of collective life, as well as against the hyper-organization which, in killing adventure, also kills the personality. The church has no need to furnish models of social organization, nor even norms. Organization and norms are necessarily variable in the course of history. There are types of society as there are types of civilization. It can also—a fact which further presupposes that the church observes and studies sociology—avert the dangers which arise, dangers of the all powerful mass without definite goal, the concomitant danger of the individual delivered up to enervating solitude, the danger of making diverse social stratifications absolute, the danger of a juridical organization so abstract that a man no longer has the possibility of meeting his neighbour.

The church will play this triple role only if it remains the church, only if it itself preserves through the centuries and through whatever sociological structures it adopts, the living congregation of those who are gathered together around the Lord in the expectation of the kingdom.

Christianity and Cosmology

DAVID W. HAY

THE aim of this article is to bring out some much-neglected New Testament teaching, to assert that the Gospel contains truths of a cosmological character, and to indicate that these truths are indispensable for understanding the new union with God that man has in Christ. The basis for these theses will be the contrast between the New Testament and Old Testament cosmologies. For there is not one cosmology in the Bible. There are at least two. The Gospel is the announcement of a New Cosmos.

1. Old Testament Cosmology

Since the Old Testament picture of the "physical universe" is a familiar one, only its broad outlines need be referred to. The picture was both sublime and quaint. It represented the earth as a shallow disc, edged with mountains and resting on a vast ocean called "the waters under the earth." Over it rose the firmament like a great inverted crystal bowl across which the heavenly bodies described their courses. Above the earth was another ocean, "the waters above the earth," which poured through "windows" in the firmament in the form of rain. Still higher were the heavens and heaven of heavens in several ranges, in which dwelt supernatural beings. The topmost heaven was the dwelling of God. This scheme is often described as a multiple-storied structure, like an apartment building. God lived in the pent-house, and man lived on the earth beneath. But he was destined to go below to a dark basement called Sheol, where the departed did not so much live as prolong a ghostly death. Many points of interesting detail may be omitted, such as the belief that the sun was not the cause of the day but only a lamp that lit it and a clock that marked its hours.

It is very important to realise that this scheme represented a scale of values. The phrase *physical universe* used a few lines above is a wrong expression, because to the ancient world generally the universe was not *physical* in our sense of the word. It was composed of four elements, earth, air, fire, and water, in an ascending scale. The elements were more divine or more spiritual, or less divine and less spiritual, according to their situation in space. Water had a double value, and hence baptismal water has a double symbolism. As referring to the spiritual waters above the firmament, baptism conveys the cleansing of the Holy Spirit who is *poured* upon us (Acts 2:17; 1 Cor. 10:2). As referring to the waters under the earth, it represents the death and destruction into which we are buried with Christ to rise again (Rom. 6:2). Each of the elements had an inherent tendency to seek

Canadian Journal of Theology, Vol. V (1959), No. 4

its own region. Fire belonged to the bright heavens. That was where the sun, moon, and the stars were, and where the lightning came from. Therefore the flames of a fire on the earth always flickered upward, striving towards their own place. A stone loosed from the hand would immediately fall to the ground, because it belonged to the ground. The middle region was the place of air, where the winds were caused by the breath of spirits whose faces are drawn on ancient maps. Man's breath or "spirit" came from *above* him, animating his dust and giving him participation in "higher" things. Baptismal water, acting *opere operato* (because it was not just "physical"), could regenerate him with a new spiritual life. But man's place was on the earth. It was impious for him to attempt to leave it, unless God made a special exception, as tradition said he did for Elijah, who was carried to heaven in a vehicle with the appropriate motive power, a chariot of fire. The sin of the builders of the Tower of Babel was that they in too literal a sense "got above themselves": "Go to," they said, "let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven."

St. Paul gives us a passage in which he very clearly enunciates the doctrine of differing values among creaturely things. The subject is so important that his words must be quoted here. We may take the liberty of substituting the word *value* for the word *glory*, for the Greek *doxa* stands for the Hebrew *kabhodh* in its sense of *weight* or *honour*.

> All flesh is not the same flesh; but there is one kind of flesh of men, another of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the value of the celestial is one, and the value of the terrestrial is another. There is one value of the sun, and another value of the moon, and another value of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in value. So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory (honour) . . . There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body (1 Cor. 15:39ff.).

Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (v. 50) because they belong to the earth and have no right to the heavenly regions.

The cosmological scale expresses differences in *being* and *value*. God was not regarded as insubstantial, but he was more glorious in his "substance" (though this term is not used) than light itself, for he dwelt in the light which no man can approach unto (1 Tim. 6:16). We tend to lose the meaning of many such expressions because we treat them as metaphors and forget the cosmological realism out of which they come. Yahweh was originally thought of as a sky God, a God of thunder and lightning, a God of the mountainous country of Sinai. No one was to climb or even touch that mountain save his privileged servant Moses, whose face afterwards shone with the light of the Presence. The idea of God's transcendent brightness was not lost but only extended when the Hebrews saw that all heaven and earth—and especially heaven—are full of his glory. He might, indeed, display his glory anywhere. The Psalmist says adoringly that God is so inescapable that even if he were to go down to Sheol he would find that

God was there before him (Ps. 139:8), and Isaiah in a sublime passage speaks of God as dwelling in the high and holy place and yet also with him that is of a humble spirit (57:15). But the highest heaven is thought of more especially as God's *throne* because it is above man and all things, the place of rule and authority from which he could govern the earth as his footstool (Isa. 66:1). If we desire to understand the Old Testament, we must not too quickly abstract the "theological concept" from its "cosmological vesture." For our own theology we shall in some degree have to turn this language into symbol, but in Scripture it is intended realistically.

Man's being and value are in this scheme very different from God's. It is a bad error to imagine, as some have imagined, that the Christian faith puts man at the centre of things. A centre belongs to a circle. It is the point around which the circumference goes. It is the focus, and the rest is periphery. In the Old Testament picture, there is no centre. There is a top and a bottom—and man is at the bottom. When modern astronomy began to reveal to us the immense size of the physical universe and to speak in terms of millions of galaxies of stars among which our galaxy is only a small unit, there were some who felt that this discovery was a blow to the Christian religion. How could we continue to believe in a religion that put man at the centre of things when we had to agree now that in reality he is far out on the edge? In fact, however, the astronomical discoveries were more in tune with the Old Testament. God set his own glory above the heavens, not man's (Ps. 8:1)—until he sent his Christ, who changed the whole picture. But to say that is to anticipate. Meanwhile it is necessary to note that the Psalmist whose words have just been quoted is surprised, when he considers the heavens, that God is mindful at all of such a lowly being as man (vv. 3f.). To an Isaiah, the inhabitants of the earth are but as grasshoppers in the sight of him who sitteth upon the circle of the earth (40:22). Knowing profoundly the "infinite qualitative difference between God and man," the men of the Old Testament themselves fastened upon astronomical terms as a measure of the difference. "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the earth hath he given to the children of men" (Ps. 115:16). On the earth man has dominion, but not above it. Let him keep his place. He is not the "centre" of things.

Even to say this is to allow man too much, for man's dominion over earthly things is regarded in the Old Testament as only temporary. He was destined to go even lower, according to earlier Hebrew thought. Sheol, or the Pit, being under the surface of the earth, was cut off from the light of the heavens, that is, from life and God. When man's breath left him, it went back to the God who gave it. His breath was not a *soul* in the sense of an individual spirit. It was that animating air from above that resumed its own region when a man died. His body returned to the ground, where it belonged, but a wraith or ghost of him persisted in the darkness below.

> Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? . . . Shall thy wonders be known in the land of forgetfulness? (Ps. 88:10, 12)

In the Psalmist's mouth these are rhetorical questions expressing the inconceivability of anything but a negative answer. For him the grave was the dark end of life, save as a man might continue in his posterity. Both man's being and man's value are expressed in these terms.

2. New Testament Cosmology

The New Testament announces a radical change in this cosmological structure bringing to man the gift of a new being and a new value. However we may desire to demythologize the Gospel, we shall grievously fail to understand it unless we first take seriously and realistically its spatial and physico-spiritual statements.

Against the Old Testament cosmological background, the New Testament says something immeasurably great about God.

> He came down to earth from heaven
> Who is Lord and God of all,
> And His shelter was a stable,
> And His cradle was a stall.

Before the Incarnation, space was the measure of God's transcendence. It is now the measure of his humility, of his love, and of his power to come infinitely near. Expressed in terms of being, the Incarnation means a permanent union in Christ between God and man that obliterates the old distance between heaven and earth, although it does not obliterate the distinction between Creator and creature. Newman hymns the Wisest Love that brought it about that

> . . . a higher gift than grace
> Should flesh and blood refine,
> God's presence and His very self,
> And essence all-divine.

His words have been criticized as containing a wrong idea of grace. In Scripture grace always means God's personal presence, but the hymn seems to say that before the Incarnation grace was only an influence, and perhaps impersonal at that. Yet whatever may have been Newman's private thoughts upon grace, and although it is unfortunate that he should speak as if the Incarnation were something other than a gift of grace (rather than the acme of grace), his words do nevertheless mark the fact that beforehand there was not grace after this mode. The hypostatic union of the divine and human natures in the God-man gives God himself, so to speak, a history; changes his relation to his creation; alters the internal structure of the cosmos; gives man by promise a new being, already fulfilled in Christ; and carries with it ultimately the "spiritualization" or "glorification" of the whole creation. It is wrong, because very inadequate, to describe Christianity as "a theistic religion." What we have here is not theism. It is an initial theistic picture transformed by a new union of the Creator with his

creation and the consequent transformation of the creation. The cosmology of the New Testament is so new that it has to say new things about the Creator as well as about the cosmos. Of course the Church has never made the error of saying that God himself became a new kind of God. It has had to conceive him as being triune from the beginning. So conceiving him it has been able to speak of God's assumption of human nature in the Person of the Son as a new and permanent act of the Godhead.

Viewing the matter in this light, and against the picture of man and the world held by the Hebrews and all the ancients, we can enter more fully into the thrill and the joy of the first proclamation of the Gospel. It announced stupendous things—nothing less than the "divinization" of man. The word should not trouble us, if we see it against the ancient cosmic scale. It does not mean that man became God. It means that he was lifted from his earthly nature into a heavenly nature, acquiring an unwontedly godlike being and union. Some of the features of this change need examination.

What had happened in the Incarnation became clear only in the Resurrection and, more particularly, in the Ascension. Christ *in his manhood* ascended to the right hand of the Majesty on High. This was no place for man, as we have seen. An Eastern prayer speaks of the surprise of the angels at seeing a Man appearing in heaven. What happened to Christ will happen to his whole Church, for he is the firstborn among many brethren (Rom. 8:29. Cp. Col. 1:15, 18; 1 Cor. 15:23; etc.). This means that in Christ man will have a new dominion. Hitherto he has had dominion over the earth (Gen. 1:26; Ps. 8:6ff.). Now he will share God's throne, and judge angels (1 Cor. 6:3. Cp. 1 Cor. 3:21ff.; 1 Pet. 1:12). At first he was made "a little lower than the angels," but now in Christ he stands above them (Hebr. 1:4–14). It is true that "we see not yet all things put under him, but we see Jesus . . . crowned with glory and honour," and the victory of Jesus is the earnest of his brothers' (Heb. 2:5ff.). In Christ, man has a new image of God upon him, far transcending the old image. He is now God's Son.[1] We have seen that the Psalmist said, "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's: but the earth hath he given to the children of men" (115:16). Now we have to say, "All this, and heaven too!" James Moffatt gives a very appealing rendering of Philippians 3:20 when he makes Paul say, "We are a colony of heaven," as if heaven were the Church's home country and it were here colonizing the earth for heaven, adapting it to heaven's ways. The idea is not in itself wrong, because the New Testament necessarily thinks of the City of God as coming down from God out of heaven (Rev. 21:10). Here too we are shown heaven no longer remaining in heaven but transforming earth. But St. Paul is thinking in the reverse direction. "Our conversation, our citizenship (*politeuma*) is in heaven." In Christ man is already exalted to heaven. Paul goes on: ". . . from whence

1. For a treatment of the differences between the Old Testament and new Testament notions of the image, see David Cairns: *The Image of God in Man*, Chapters I and II.

also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." We shall attend in a moment to this reference to the body. Meantime it enforces the point that Christ will come from the place to which the Christian already really belongs.

The article in the creed that says, "He descended into hell," is expounded in Reformed theology as meaning that Christ bore on our behalf all the pains of Hell. This interpretation is a good example of coming too quickly to the symbolical or "spiritual" meaning and missing the primary cosmological reference. If it is a cardinal doctrine of the New Testament, as we have been arguing, that man has ceased to be earth-bound, we must not ignore the steps by which the new "spiritual" state is reached. It is reached, according to the New Testament, by God's fashioning a new creation. It is not to be expected that the New Testament would remain silent about Sheol. The gates of Hell, said Jesus, would not prevail against his Church (Matt. 16:19). The risen Christ is the firstfruits of all that sleep in him (1 Cor. 15:20, 23). For the believer, Hades is abolished. To die is to go at once to be with Christ (Phil. 1:23). When belief in a life after death arrived in Judaism, it came in the form of the resurrection of the body. In the New Testament it comes not only as resurrection but, further, as ascension and glorification. Resurrection alone is too earth-bound without the transformation of glorification.[2] But to the ancient mind these things could not be unless God did something about Sheol. Before asking what difficulties the idea might cause us with our modern notions, we should not be surprised at the appearance in the New Testament of the belief that Christ displayed his power there (1 Pet. 3:19ff.; 4:6). Here we see the radicalness of his change of the old cosmic scheme.

The theme of man's "divinization" is a standing one in the New Testament. Our Lord said that there is no marriage in heaven (Matt. 22:30). In Christ there is a new creation. Old things have passed away; and all things—not men's minds only—have become new (2 Cor. 5:17). If our earthly house is dissolved, we have an eternal one in the heavens, for which we long (vv. 1ff.). Christians are to meet Christ in the air, on their way to heaven as he comes towards them (1 Thess. 4:17). Eschatologically speaking, Christians have already ascended (Ephes. 1:3; 2:6); therefore they are to set their affection on things above (Col. 3:1ff.). The whole theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the contrast between the earthiness of the old revelation and the heavenliness of the new (12:25). It is an error to imagine that its ideas derive from Platonism. They come from the new cosmology.[3]

2. There are in Jewish apocalyptic important pointers to the New Testament teaching. See S. B. Frost, "Visions of the End" in the *Canadian Journal of Theology*, July 1959 (Vol. V, No. 3), p. 160.

3. Cairns (*op. cit.*, p. 42) goes so far as to say that 2 Pet. 1:4 is the only text that clearly supports the idea of divinization. J. L. M. Haire takes a similar line in opposing Thornton and Mascall in his essay "On behalf of Chalcedon" [T. H. L. Parker (ed.): *Essays in Christology for Karl Barth*, pp. 104–109].

All that has been said sets a new *value* on man, expressed in terms of the value-scale of the old cosmology. We must now add that the new creation gives man a new *being*, corresponding to his new value and expressed also in terms of the old scale of being. We have already quoted St. Paul's saying about the changing of "our vile body." He is not here falling into Manichaeism. The Revised Standard Version correctly translates his expression "our lowly body" (*sōma tēs tapeinōseōs*). Man's body is at present earthy. If he is to inherit heaven he must be given a body appropriate to the heavenly regions, like the one which Christ already has (Phil. 3:21). The earthly body is not bad because it is lowly. But it is not heavenly. Whether we die before Christ comes or not, "we shall all be changed," living and dead alike (1 Cor. 15:51f.). We need to be redeemed from the body (Rom. 7:24; 8:23; 2 Cor. 5:2, 8; Gal. 4:3). There is in the New Testament, that is to say, a doctrine of redemption that is not a doctrine of redemption from sin alone. Much as this idea may be resisted, it is inescapable if we are willing to give the New Testament cosmology the place it deserves. St. Paul is very explicit in his teaching upon a change in man's being or nature which is not simply a change from sinfulness to sanctity but a rise to a higher nature. The *locus classicus* is 1 Corinthians 15. We can offer here only a few reminders of what he says.

> There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which was spiritual, but that which is natural: and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption (vv. 44–50).

Corruption does not here mean in the first place sinfulness, any more than it does later: "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (v. 53). Corruptibility is the change and decay that in all around we see. But it has no place in the heavenly order, and therefore the Gospel offers man a great hope.

It is not hard to see the connection between this kind of corruptibility and the corruption of sin. St. Paul teaches that God has made two creations, first the natural one and then the spiritual one. The natural one was good, but changeable.

> For the creature was made subject to vanity (*mataiotēs*), not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, because the creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption (*phthora*) into the glorious liberty of the children of God (Rom. 8:20f.).

Mataiotēs and *phthora* are closely related and are not in the first place connected with sin. The former may also be translated *transitoriness*, and the latter is the *dissolution* into which it issues. That the first creation was

of this nature was not due to its own act (*'ouch hekousa*, "not willingly"). God gave it this nature with the hope of a new one. But because flesh and blood can change, man was capable of falling into sin, and did so. As it is sometimes put, Adam had a "mortable" nature which through sin actually became subject to death. Corruptibility of one kind made *possible* a more tragic corruption of another kind. If sin and death are finally to be overcome and the Fall is not to happen again, man will need to be given a new nature, different from the one that he was given at the first creation. Then he will be "more than conqueror" (Rom. 8:37). Redemption is not just restoration. It is not just victory. It is elevation to a form of existence unknown before.

> So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory" (1 Cor. 15:54).

It may be suggested that what is offered in this great theme is not so much a new cosmology as a new anthropology. Certainly it is a new anthropology, but it is a cosmological anthropology. We cannot altogether extract the new statements about man from the new statements about the cosmos. For, in the first place, a new statement is made about God's being and his union with man; in the next place, man is given a new relation to God, is "spiritualized" so as to be more like him in being, and also is given a new relation to the earth and what we call "the world of nature." Lastly, the world of nature itself is to be transformed, for it, too, groans and travails as it waits for an adoption in which it will share (Rom. 8:19ff.; 2 Pet. 3:13; Rev. 21:1). These are cosmological, not just anthropological statements.

3. Cosmology and our Faith

Although the Hebrew picture is completely outmoded as "scientific" cosmology, we have inherited from it and from the ancient world generally a language that we shall never outgrow. We are not likely to cease speaking of the sun rising and going down, although we know that in actual fact it never rises or sets. Because space belongs to our very natures, we shall always speak in spatial terms. The little word *in*, for example, performs a very ample duty *in* non-spatial relationships. We talk of a man of *high* character or of *low* morals. We talk of the musical scale (ladder), as if pitch really went up and down. Space stands analogically for many relationships and will serve always to bear religious meanings because God is necessarily *above* us. At the Ascension Jesus rose from the earth before the eyes of his wondering disciples, to represent his return to the glory of the Father. How else could we have represented the act of resuming what we call a *higher* state? The cloud that received him out of their sight, was not, according to the commentators, our common, "physical" cloud (Acts 1:9). It is the "spiritual" cloud of the glory of God that descended upon the tabernacle in the wilderness and appeared at the Mount of Transfiguration.

But the matter cannot rest there, as if it were one only of the use of spatial language for essentially non-spatial realities. We spiritualize falsely if we so spiritualize Biblical cosmology as to lose touch with *being*. The ancients were not wrong in seeing some kind of identity between being and value.[4] Even in the state of glory, when man has his heavenly body, some kind of space must be involved, although it is space of a different dimension from the space that we know here, and heaven therefore cannot be located somewhere in our present space. If there is personal, creaturely existence at all, it must have some kind of being and structure. That is to say, Christianity is bound to be cosmological in speaking of the consummated order, just as it has to be cosmological in speaking of the first creation and the history of redemption. But the cosmological relations that it is interested in are not dealt with by astronomical physics. Christianity is not committed to any particular "scientific" cosmology or cosmogony. But as committed to belief in a glorified state it is committed in principle to the cosmological or ontological structures implied in such a state. Again, since that state is the fulfilment, not merely the destruction, of present structures, it believes that these structures participate by analogy in the fulfilled state. Lastly, it declares, eschatologically speaking, that in Christ and the Spirit the old creation already bears the marks of the new. The spatial language that the Christian uses is therefore not a merely metaphorical reference to essentially non-spatial realities. It has sacramental power. The signs really participate in what they refer to. Our Lord's rising from the earth is not an "empty" or "external" symbol of his glorification. The event itself is in this act. They are right who say that we need not so much to "demythologize" the Gospel as to "re-mythologize" it. Perhaps it would be better still to say that we are not here dealing with myth at all—unless modern scientific cosmology is as mythical as ancient! To take cosmology out of Christianity is to abandon Christianity.

There are many implications of this standpoint for modern attitudes in theology and religion. We may conclude by rapidly sketching a few of them.[5]

(a) Christianity cannot be reduced to I-Thou categories. The divine-human encounter theme is in danger of being overplayed. The New Testament has as well a wholesome, strongly objective note, much needed to correct the subjectivity of the other. It announced changes in the cosmos as such, as objective in their character as the Ascension. Men were excited to hear of the dawn of a New Day, not because they had had an "encounter." Of course, the "encounter" theme is important. But it is not adequate. In our struggle away from an individualistic, subjective pietism,

4. "We are now so used to the materialistic way of looking at things, which has been rooted in our literature by the genius of the seventeenth century, that it is with some difficulty that we understand the possibility of another mode of approach to the problems of nature" (A. N. Whitehead: *Science and the Modern World*, p. 53).

5. We must omit reference even to such an important subject as the bearing of this teaching upon the notion of the Church as the Body of Christ, or upon Millenarian doctrines that are still too earth-bound.

we have not advanced very far if we only arrive at community-subjectivism with its obnoxious "fellowshipping." We need cosmic winds to deliver us from religious self-absorption. The New Testament Gospel says to the modern man that there is meaning in his life and in his history only if he looks beyond both to the destiny of the cosmos.

(b) New Testament ethics are grounded in its New Cosmology. The first creation is good, being God's, but it is not so good as that which is appearing. Therefore the Christian is to sit lightly to all earthly things. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth . . . For after all these things do the Gentiles seek" (Matt. 6:19, 32). Christians must weep, rejoice, buy, hold possessions as those who do not weep, or rejoice, or buy, or hold posessions, using this world as not abusing it, for the present cosmic order is passing out (1 Cor. 7:30f.). Marriage is good, but there is a leaning in the New Testament towards celibacy (Matt. 19:12; 1 Cor. 7:7). Money, no doubt, is also good, but it is hard for a rich man to be saved (Matt. 19:16ff.). The theme can be copiously illustrated from the New Testament that the Christian should be "unworldly," if one may dare to use an unpopular and dangerous term. The recovery, so marked in modern theology and so typical of our age as a whole, of the doctrine that the body is good should not be allowed to obscure the New Testament teaching that it is also lowly and must be kept in its place by discipline and subjection (1 Cor. 9:27). There can be little question of the relevance of this attitude towards our contemporary softness.

(c) From the cosmological standpoint it is impossible to be content with the view that justification by faith is the material principle of the Christian religion. God has not only justified man in Christ. The forgiveness of sins, vitally important though it be, is not the whole of the Gospel. God has made a new creation and given man a new heavenly status. One can only know about it in faith, but knowing it is not knowing that one is justified. To speak in this way may invoke the wrath of some "evangelicals," for evangelicalism has come to mean concentration upon our justification through the atoning sacrifice of Christ. "The doctrine of the Atonement came to be regarded as the palladium of Orthodox Protestantism; only the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Bible can be compared with it in importance from this point of view."[6] But concentration upon the Atonement is not so much evangelical as Western. It as typical of Roman theology as of Protestant. Aulén, who has just been quoted, shows very well, for purposes very different from those of this article, that although at the Reformation many took the crucifix off the altar they did not take it out of their theology. It is characteristic of much Western theology to look askance at the idea of "divinization," as against the Greek Fathers and the Eastern Church, where it is a familiar theme. But in the West it has often been brushed aside by the time-honoured device of fathering it on

6. G. Aulén: *Christus Victor*, p. 149.

Greek philosophy.[7] It is true that we must not diminish "the Cruciality of the Cross." But we do diminish it if we fail to see the Cross as the place where Christ stripped off his flesh in manifesting the new creation (Col. 2: 15).[8] The Greek Fathers did not derive their doctrine of divinization from philosophy but from Biblical cosmology, and if they are to be regarded as having had a "physical" notion of redemption, this was only as it had to be, if they were to be loyal to the New Testament revelation.

By God's appointment in the first creation man is meant to have dominion over the earth. Here all the science and technology of the new space-age find their justification. Let man travel to Mars, for Mars too, theologically speaking, is *earth*! But this dominion is only a symbol of a greater, heavenly dominion. The Christian must take his stand in the heavenlies, above all the conflicts and disturbances of this passing age. Having set his affection on things above, not on things on the earth, he can let the peace of God rule in his heart (Col. 3: 2, 15).

7. The attitude of the Roman Catholic, J. Rivière, is identical at this point with that of Cairns and Haire. See his *Doctrine of the Atonement*, Vol. I, pp. 153, 182, 203, 208, 214, 236. While defending the Biblical sources of the teaching of the Greek Fathers, one must not be taken as claiming that they never strayed into error.

8. C. Anderson Scott: *Christianity According to St. Paul*, p. 34.

The Doctrine of God

PIETER De JONG

It happened during the last world-war. The Nazis had lost their cause; yet they decided to build a wall of defence along the coast of Western Europe against possible invasion. For this purpose the population of many towns and villages along the shore had to be evacuated. One can well imagine what this meant for many who had lived there for generations. At a certain hour of the day everybody had to be ready with a suitcase containing only the most essential articles. A fisherwoman who found herself in the company of a clergyman while being transported inland on a truck, asked: "If God is our Father, how can he allow this thing to happen?" She had probably been a faithful churchgoer all her life, like many who live close to the sea. Now she went through a crisis and wondered if her faith could survive.

Similar situations occur in every pastoral charge in any country and at any time, when inexplicable events occur, like disasters, accidents, sudden deaths—particularly of young people. All ministers have been asked at some time during their pastorates: "If God is a God of love, why does he do this to me?" And the minister-theologian realizes one thing in such situations: belief in the Fatherhood of God is not the conclusion to a logical argument. Acceptance of the Fatherhood of God on so-called logical grounds may last for awhile, as long as times are peaceful and life is rosy. Then we may go so far as to say: "Behind all we see around us there must be some power we can call our Father, because nature and history give evidence that he cares for us. Life as a whole, although it has its dark sides, shows a wonderful pattern."

This, however, is not faith. It is rather a world-view in which we give God a place we consider suitable for him. In times of crisis this world-view collapses, just as in Job's situation, the rational world-view of his friends, based on the doctrine of retribution, could not stand up. This leads us to our first point:

1. The Fatherhood of God is a part of God's self-revelation as the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, three-in-one.

In biblical thought God is not in the first place our Father, but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of the Son. He is Father in himself first of all. The Fatherhood of God and the sonship of man, even in the Old Testament, are not general truths, but a relationship grasped in faith. Israel's sonship is a matter of election and adoption. "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son" (Hosea 11:1).

When Malachi asks the question: "Have we not all one Father? Has not one God created us?" (2:10), this is said against the background of the covenant-relationship in which Israel has been chosen by God to be a partner, as it is immediately followed by the words: "Why then are we faithless to one another profaning the covenant of our fathers?" Paul connects sonship with the Spirit of God who is the Spirit of adoption (Rom. 8:15).

In Jesus Christ alone do we really know God and are we able to grasp something of the mystery of his Fatherhood, as he is the Father who did not spare his Son on the cross. The cross remains a folly or a scandal for the natural man until the Spirit of God opens his eyes to this mystery so that in it he sees the very heart of God laid open. The Spirit removes the veil from men's minds (2 Cor. 3:14ff.).

Jesus Christ is the objective and the Holy Spirit is the subjective self-revelation of God, who is the hidden God (deus absconditus) but who in Christ has made himself somewhat visible.[1] Here we are right at the heart of the doctrine of God. He who says "doctrine of God" must say "doctrine of the Trinity," which implies that true knowledge of God from the beginning to the end is the work of God. We cannot know the Father except through the Son and the Holy Spirit.

God is our Father in Christ, through the Holy Spirit. The Fatherhood of God is not part of a world-view but a relationship grasped in faith by the human being as a whole (not just by his reason), on the basis of God's self-disclosure in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ—in spite of everything which can point to the opposite. On the basis of revelation alone are we able to say with the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in God the Father . . ."

There is a great deal of unitarianism in our churches.[2] There is first of all the kind which speaks of God the Father as Creator-God, apart from his revelation in Jesus Christ. According to this type of Faith, Jesus the teacher came to tell of the outgoing love of this Creator-God whom we can call our Father, as he did in the parable of the prodigal son. It is forgotten that this parable is a parable of the Kingdom of God, told by Christ, who is God's kingship in the flesh, and who is fulfilling his mission which will end on the cross. In repeating the Lord's prayer it is often forgotten that this is the prayer taught by Jesus in whom we know God as our Father. Although we do not use the phrase "in the name of Christ" in this prayer, it cannot be prayed except in the Spirit of him through whom we know and come to the Father.

There is, in the second place, the kind of unitarianism which worships Jesus Christ in a way that excludes the Father (much more the Holy Spirit) as in certain types of pietism and Jesus-worship. There is, in the third place,

1. Karl Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, I, 1, ch. II, 1. Cf. I, 2, ch. II, 2, 3.
2. Cf. H. Richard Niebuhr, "The Doctrine of the Trinity and the Unity of the Church," in *Theology Today*, III, 3, Oct. 1946, quoted by C. Welch, *In this Name*, (New York, 1952), p. 227.

the kind which worships only the Holy Spirit and values personal experience above anything else. There is a fourth kind of unitarianism which we might call "ontological." It claims to take seriously the "symbols" of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, but in a Sabellian sense, so that they actually express what is behind them, which is the One, called being itself, the God behind the God of Theism. "The God who appears when God has disappeared in the anxiety of doubt," as Paul Tillich says.[3]

The Christian year is an excellent test of our doctrine of God. If we are unitarians of the Creator-type of religion, we shall have very little use for Christmas and Easter, except as celebrations of the winter-solstice and the return of spring. If we are unitarians of the Jesus-type of religion, we may celebrate Christmas and Easter, but we have no use for Pentecost. If we are unitarians of the Spirit-type of religion, we divorce Pentecost from the other Christian festivals, or use Christmas and Easter as illustrations of what life in the Spirit can accomplish. In none of these cases is there place for Trinity Sunday, following Whitsunday or Pentecost. The symbolic significance of the order is precisely that with Pentecost God's self-revelation is complete. Christmas is the festival of Emmanuel. In "God with us" we know that God is for us. "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (John 14:9). In the way he is with us we know how he is for us. Without Pentecost the celebration of Jesus' birth, death and resurrection would be mere commemoration; through Pentecost they become participation. Christmas becomes our new birth in him; Good Friday our death to sin in him; Easter our rising to eternal life in him; Ascension our life being hid with Christ in God (Col. 3:1–3). Without Pentecost there might have been a group of followers of Jesus today, inspired by his example (as Socrates has always had admirers and followers) but no idea of the Christian Church as the Body of Christ. Pentecost means that God himself becomes the link between Christ and us so that we are not left to ourselves in following his example. The Holy Spirit is the divine love which is poured out into our hearts: God as he comes closest to us—the breath or kiss of God. Trinity Sunday expresses that true knowledge and service of God is his own work from the beginning to the end.

The second point we have to consider is the centrality of Christ in God's revelation.

2. God's self-disclosure is centred in Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, by whom all things were made.

The doctrine of the Trinity is not a secondary doctrine. The case is not that by ourselves we are capable of saying a number of true things about God which we finally clarify with the concept of "father" to make everything more personal. Revelation is not sublime speculation; it is an act of God.

Nor is it the case that our "natural knowledge" of God forms a kind of

3. Conclusion of final chapter in Paul Tillich, *The Courage to Be*, (London, 1955).

vestibule to our faith in him as the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, three in one, as though the doctrine of the Trinity were the crown God himself places on our human thinking. Thomas Aquinas held it possible for human reason to come to a general idea about God. We may recall his famous arguments for the existence of God: the arguments from motion, causality, contingency, perfection and design.[4] The doctrine of the Trinity for him is revealed doctrine but rests upon this general idea of God in the way of an extension. His theology presupposes a relationship between nature and grace as the lower and upper levels of a two-story building. Grace perfects nature.

The reformation rejected this type of structure for two reasons. In the first place the reformers emphasized that grace and nature are not two components. Grace is an attribute of God and nature the work of his hands. Opposite to grace is God's anger or wrath. Grace for the reformers does not perfect but recreates nature. He who is in Christ is a new creation (2 Cor. 5:17). In the second place they objected on the basis of the doctrine of the Image of God and the Fall. If grace recreates nature, faith is not merely a *donum superadditum* which has been lost in the fall without causing any further damage on the natural level. Man may have a *sensus divinitatis* or the *semen religionis* in his heart, but this does not necessarily mean that he of himself is able to ask the right question, let alone come to a preliminary answer which merely needs an addendum.[5]

At this point we are in the very middle of the problem of "natural theology and "natural revelation." These terms are not always used in a careful manner so that a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding among theologians has arisen. Much discussion has been stimulated by the controversy between Barth and Brunner on this point. Let us begin with saying that natural theology and natural revelation are not the same thing. One may accept natural revelation without necessarily believing that natural theology is a possibility. Revelation is an act of God. Theology is the work of man, in response to revelation. The Bible undoubtedly teaches that God reveals himself in nature, history and the human conscience. But does this imply the possibility of a natural theology, in the sense of the formulation of truth about God either as a preliminary statement or as final truth, discovered by man as he is without God's regenerating grace? The terms "general" and "special" knowledge of God are misleading for this very reason.[6]

When we say that God reveals himself in nature, history and man's conscience, we have to clarify our statement further. We do not mean that these are open books from which man, without help, can read the truth or even part of the truth about God. This mistake is frequently made in Christian Education. A satire of a nineteenth-century novelist, Multatuli, tells the

4. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, 2, art. 1–3.
5. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book I, Chapter 3.
6. H. Kraemer, *Religion and the Christian Faith*, London, 1956, Chapter 20. Cf. alsc Chapters 17 and 18 on the exegesis of Romans 1 and 2.

story of a father who took his son for a walk in the woods and started to explain to him how everything in nature tells us of God's love: the flowers, the trees, the birds, etc. After a while they saw a bird picking a worm out of the ground. The child pointed at the worm curling itself in agony around the bill of the bird, and asked his father: "That worm, too, daddy?" There is concealment as well as revelation in the realm of God's creation. An honest poet called nature "red in tooth and claw." The seventy-third Psalm is true of life on the international as well as on the personal scale. One can be misled by the good fortune of the wicked, and one remains confused until one enters the sanctuary of God.

When we say that God reveals himself in nature, history and the human conscience, we say this on the basis of God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ, the Word, who made everything. As Calvin said, the revelation of God through Scripture provides us with a pair of glasses with which we are able to read God's revelation elsewhere. The poet who wrote the nineteenth Psalm saying that the heavens declare the glory of God was speaking of the God whom he knew from the Torah which is perfect, converting the soul and making wise the simple. On the basis of God's self-revelation in Christ we can say with the Apostle: "Yet he did not leave himself without witness, for he did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, satisfying your hearts with food and gladness (Acts 14:17).

It seems to me that this interpretation is in keeping also with Paul's teaching in the well known opening chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. What Paul says there about the revelation of God to the gentiles is stated in the light of the revelation of God's righteousness in Jesus Christ. The interesting aspect of his argument is that it is not straight logic but dialectic. On the one hand he says that God reveals his wrath, his deity, the work of the law. He admits their knowing and perceiving to some extent. On the other hand he does not go on and say: therefore they have a good though imperfect understanding of God. He rather states the opposite: They never come to the right response in the sense of the true knowledge of God, implying gratitude and service. The same applies to his teaching on the work of the law. Although these are pointers to God's work, man does not come to repentence because of them but is rather filled with pride which is his original sin. These pointers to God lead in unregenerated man to idolatry. Knowledge of God in the Bible is never abstract knowledge, but concerns man as a whole. Because of sin man is kept from the right response which implies obedience. Paul's conclusion is based on the fifty-third Psalm:

> The fool says in his heart: there is no God,
> They are corrupt, doing abominal iniquity;
> There is none that does good.
> God looks down from heaven
> Upon the sons of man,
> To see if there are any that are wise,
> That seek after God.

They have all fallen away;
They are all alike depraved.
There is none that does good, no not one.

The words "fool" and "wise" are not used in a rational sense, but indicate the existential character of man's decision in response to God's seeking after him. The matter of knowledge of God is often dealt with in much too abstract a manner. Revelation in the Bible is not merely imparting information but transformation at the same time. Unless God breaks through our vicious circle of self-interest, we cannot truly know him or serve him. This break-through is called "revelation" in the full sense of the word: the personal encounter (in I-Thou relationship) in which we are no longer the subject and he the object. As long as we, with our man-centred questions, try to find out things about God, we make him in our own image and inevitably come to idolatry. In the act of revelation in Christ through the Spirit we come to know him and serve him as sons. He gives our lives a new centre. In making them God-centred he restores us to his image. This is revelation as complete act, including the subjective response in man, worked by the Holy Spirit.

For our attitude toward the non-Christian religions this means that we take seriously the word of the Apostle: "And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). Knowledge of God in the Bible is saving knowledge. The religions of the world do not only point to God's seeking after man; they at the same time express man's distorted response to God's work. This is also true of Christianity as a religion. As a religion it often has demonic features, as the Jewish religion had also.[7] We cannot possibly accept a picture like that of the ladder in which the various religions form the lower rungs while Christianity is the top one. It is not a matter of "You have a bit, I have more." Whether our religion is Christian or not depends on God's grace which we do not have at our disposal. It depends on the Holy Spirit who alone can work the right response to the saving acts of God.

This leads to our third point:

3. The Spirit of God and His Spirit alone makes us receptive and open for the objective revelation of God as the Father in Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of adoption who also conforms us to the image of God in Christ.

Let us go back for a moment to the question asked by the woman mentioned at the beginning of this article: "If God is our Father, how can he allow this thing to happen?" Why did she have trouble in calling God her Father? Because she had some idea of what a father is or should be, and she found difficulty in reconciling this picture with the way in which God dealt with her. Our picture of a father is often that of a kind and rather indulgent type of a person, more like a grandfather.

7. Cf. Barth's definition of all human religion as "lack of faith," in op. cit. I, 2.

The difficulty can also be of the opposite type. Two years ago in a youth camp in Saskatchewan there was a youngster who, whenever the Lord's prayer was repeated, stopped his fingers in his ears and refused to say it. His counsellor after some time found out that the boy's father was a habitual drunkard who used to come home at night and beat up the family. The boy could not bring himself to use the word "father" for God because for him "father" meant tyranny, capriciousness and cruel behaviour.

Noetically speaking, human fatherhood comes first. We came to know earthly fatherhood before we can grasp the divine. But from the ontological point of view God's Fatherhood is first. God is first of all the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. He is Father in himself and all earthly fatherhood is but a vague and dim mirror of this aspect of divine life. Paul is quite explicit about this in Eph. 3:15, "For this reason I bow my knees before the Father from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named."

When divine revelation takes place God takes into account our human experience, but something happens which is comparable to the new wine making the old wineskins burst. Concepts are filled with an entirely new meaning; not only that, but he applies them in our lives. The Holy Spirit makes the analogies live and applies them in the new meaning which is the original meaning.

It is, then, not the case that if I come from an ideal family, I have little or no difficulty at all in accepting the doctrine of the divine Fatherhood because I can easily climb up from the experience of the love of my parents to the love of God. The Holy Spirit can use this experience but when he does, changes take place even in the best families. Regarding the Holy Family words were heard like these: "Woman, what have I to do with you? My hour has not yet come" (John 2:4); "Did you not know that I must be in my father's house?" (Luke 2:49); "Whoever does the will of God is my brother, and sister, and mother" (Mark 3:35). It is often to people with the most strongly developed family-consciousness and a happy family background that Jesus comes and says: "If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife . . . , he cannot be my disciple (Luke 14:25). The Holy Spirit reveals the analogy from case to case.

In objecting to the manner in which the doctrine of the *Analogia Entis* is used in natural theology we do not deny that this world is the world of God's creation and that the world of human relationships and human speech is part of God's creation. What we object to is the idea that we have the analogies at our disposal. Man of himself, starting from the world of creation, is not able to come to true statements about God simply along the way of eminence or negation.

We ought not to use the so-called analogies of the Trinity in such a manner as to give the impression that man looking at the world around and within can discover the Trinity or attempt to make the Trinity acceptable because of trinitarian traces (*vestigia*) in the world of creation. The most well known analogy is that of Augustine: the trinity of memory, intellect and

will in man's mind.[8] The best modern one is that of Dorothy Sayers: the plan in the artist's mind; the work of art produced, and the effect on the minds of the admirers.[9] All these analogies can only be illustrations used by the Holy Spirit who, in using them, comes to his own, the world of his creation. He makes us share in God's knowledge of himself with the help of the things he has made.

The doctrine of the *Analogia Entis* as employed in natural theology tends to separate the knowledge of God from justification and forgiveness. It actually splits God up and leads to a denial of the "Simplicity of God."[10] We may recall Luther's struggle about the meaning of the righteousness of God as revealed in the Gospel. His trouble was that he came from the scholastic concept of righteousness: *suum cuique*, which was applied to God in the degree of perfection. Only when it had been revealed to him that the righteousness of God is helping righteousness, the righteousness revealed in Jesus Christ, did he share in the saving knowledge of God. The doctrine of the knowledge of God cannot be separated from the doctrine of justification.

This truth has far-reaching consequences for the doctrine of the Divine Attributes.[11] The division into communicable and incommunicable perfections (relative and absolute) based on the idea that the communicable ones are shared by God and man, but present in God to the degree of perfection, while the incommunicable ones, belonging only to God, are to be defined by way of negation, is doubtful.[12]

The immutability of God, for example, was understood as an incommunicable quality of God, indicating that God does not change. The Bible, however, does not give us the impression that God's immutability is the same as his inability to change. It rather means his faithfulness within the covenant by which he remains loyal to his people and which allows them to pray (Gen. 18).

The eternity of God does not merely mean the negation of time. God in Christ has actually entered human history and given it new meaning. He gives us eternal life. The infinity of God is not the same as the philosophical concept of denial or negation of space. In Christ he takes upon himself human finiteness and in Christ we share in the heavenly places.

The almighty power of God is not human or absolute power to the nth degree. It is the power in weakness revealed in the cross of Jesus, the power to which Paul refers in I Cor. 1. The wisdom of God is revealed in the foolishness of the cross. The righteousness of God is expressed in his justifying the ungodly.

God as he is in himself (*aseitas*) is no other than God in his self-revelation. God in his freedom is no other than God in his love. He is always the one

8. Augustine, *De Trinitate*, Liber X, Caput XI.
9. Dorothy L. Sayers, *The Mind of the Maker*, (New York, 1956).
10. Cf. K. Barth, op. cit., II, 1, ch. V.
11. *Ibid.*, ch. VI.
12. Cf. Heinrich Heppe, *Reformed Dogmatics*, Chapter V.

who loves in freedom. The goodness of God is severe and his severity is good.

Revelation, then, is never merely the imparting of abstract knowledge. It is the Spirit of adoption transforming human lives to the image of God in the Son. He does not merely show us the righteousness of God in Christ but makes us share in it. In other words, there is no doctrine of the knowledge of God which does not lead to the doctrine of Sanctification.

Here we touch perhaps one of the most crucial developments of theology in these days—the rediscovery of the oneness of theology and ethics. Theology means knowledge of God, but knowledge in the deepest sense of the word: fellowship with him, implying obedience. Where the two are separated both are distorted: knowledge of God becomes abstract and ethics legalistic. There is a widespread legalism in our churches which separates the law from the gospel. Its inevitable consequences are the pharisaism and hypocrisy, connected with an inability to experience the joy and peace of the Holy Spirit. It also stands in the way of reaching people in need. The church will not be able to do its task as long as the minister is identified with the moral judge. Every minister who takes his counselling task seriously knows that this is one of the the most difficult humps for people to overcome. In Christ we know that the goodness of God is severe and that at the same time his severity is good, kind and understanding.

Christian ethics occupies itself with the practical application of knowledge of God in human life. Revelation implies transformation. What the love of God the Father is—what God's righteousness, his goodness, his power, his eternity, etc., are—all has been expressed in the new humanity of Jesus Christ, on this earth and under these skies, and humanity has now been taken up into the life of God. The Holy Spirit alone, in making us share in Christ's death and resurrection, can cause us to reflect the very attributes of God in this human life, in anticipation of the revelation of perfect sonship in the life to come. The Holy Spirit is the down-payment of this future glory (Eph. 1:14). Thus our Christian ethics stands or falls upon our doctrine of God. And what else is our worship than the offering of our lives in new obedience to God? It is an offering in the Spirit through Christ to the Father, so that the words of Abelard's hymn still express the essence of adoration:

> Low before him with our praises we fall,
> Of whom, and in whom, and through whom are all;
> Of whom, the Father; and through whom, the Son;
> In whom, the Spirit, with these ever one.

Theological Education in British Columbia

F. A. PEAKE

In any new community it is only a matter of time before responsible people begin to think of the need for higher education, both that young people may be afforded opportunities of scholarship, and that the community may not be deprived of essential professional services. It may seem strange to this technical and secular age that one of the chief concerns of the early colonists on this continent was for theological seminaries through which the supply of Ministers of the Gospel might be maintained. In some very well known words describing the foundation of Harvard University it is said:

> after God had carried us safe to New England, and we had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and settled the civil government; one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning, and perpetuate it to posterity, dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches when our present ministers shall lie in the dust.[1]

There has always been a very close connexion between the universities and theological colleges, and it would not be difficult to trace the history of Canadian universities and show that many, if not most, of them owe their origin to the Christian Church in one or other of its branches, and to a concern on the part of the Church for adequate theological education.

The first suggestion concerning an institution of higher learning in what is now the Province of British Columbia seems to have come from the Reverend Charles Grenfell Nicolay, Chaplain of King's College Hospital, London. To the best of my knowledge Nicolay never visited British Columbia(later he went to Australia) but in 1853 he wrote to Prime Minister Gladstone suggesting that a Missionary College should be set up in or near Victoria. The details of his scheme were most interesting, providing not only for the formal preaching of the Gospel but also for its practical application through Christian family life, carpentry, farming, and fishing, together with medical missions. He concluded his proposal with the statement that ultimately

1. *New England's First Fruits*, Sabin's Reprints, Quarto Series VIII (1865), quoted by T. J. Wertenbaker, *The Puritan Oligarchy* (Grosset & Dunlap, New York, 1947), p. 137.

what was at first a Missionary College, must become at last the Colonial University, which, for the first time of at least English colonies, the colonists will find ready to educate their children the moment they arrive.[2]

The words were prophetic but the prophecy remained unfulfilled for many years.

Soon after the arrival in 1860 of the Right Reverend George Hills, the first Bishop of British Columbia, he wrote home to his friends in England stressing the need for schools and a university. He said,

I am anxious to find a good man to take the headship of a Collegiate Institution. It will be well-supported, I doubt not. . . . I should like to plant here a germ of sound Religious learning, which might hereafter be the great Northern University of these western regions; and which might send forth Missionaries onwards to lighten even China itself.[3]

Again, these were prophetic words. The collegiate schools for boys and girls were duly established but, even though the bishop spoke frequently concerning it, the university remained a thing to come. It is interesting to note in passing that when the British Columbia University Act was passed in 1890 (even though the university did not then come into being) it fell to the Right Reverend Acton Windeyer Sillitoe, first Bishop of New Westminster, to preside at the initial meeting of Convocation.[4]

Our immediate concern, however, is with theological education and, as in many other places, steps for the training of men for the Sacred Ministry were taken in British Columbia long before the provision of any university facilities.

The first efforts in this direction were undertaken by the Roman Catholic Church under whose auspices a course of theological instruction was given to two candidates at St. Michael's Mission, Harbledown Island, near Alert Bay, in 1871–72. A few years later a similar course was given at Mission City, between 1880 and 1882, to four members of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate including Adrian Gabriel Morice, later to become known as the historian of his church in western Canada. These two ventures can hardly be described as the establishment of theological colleges; rather were they emergency measures undertaken to meet a particular situation.

The honour of establishing the first theological college in British Columbia belongs to the Methodists who opened Columbian College in New Westminster in 1892, but we shall defer a consideration of its history in order to continue the story of Roman Catholic theological education. The Nazareth Junior seminary, also at New Westminster, was set up in 1896 by the Most Reverend Paul Durien, Bishop of New Westminster. It was

2. *A Proposal to establish a Missionary College on the North West Coast of British America in a letter to the Right Honourable William Ewart Gladstone, M.P., from the Reverend Charles Grenfell Nicolay, F.R.G.S., Librarian of King's College, London* (Saunders and Stanford, London, 1853).

3. *Occasional Paper,* The Columbia Mission (June, 1860), p. 34.

4. *Tuum Est: A History of the University of British Columbia,* by Harry T. Logan (University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 1958), p. 5.

staffed by the Oblates of Mary Immaculate and usually had about fifteen students. The seminary was closed in 1909, and the property sold in the following year.[5]

It should perhaps be explained that Roman Catholic theological education is divided into two parts, that of the minor seminary which consists of a four year course in Philosophy similar to the B.A. course of an ordinary university, followed by three years of Theology in what is called a major seminary. For twenty years after the closing of the Nazareth Junior Seminary there was no provision for Roman Catholic theological training in British Columbia, but in 1932 the Seminary of Christ the King was established at Ladner under the aegis of the Archbishop of Vancouver, the Most Reverend William Mark Duke. In 1929, Mrs. McNeely had bequeathed Jubilee Farm, a property of 129 acres, to the archdiocese for use as an educational foundation, and it was this property which the archbishop was able to use for the new seminary. This, also, was a minor seminary from which the students went to St. Joseph's Seminary, Edmonton, for the theological course.

Almost immediately after the establishment of the Seminary of Christ the King, Archbishop Duke wrote to the Benedictine monks at Mount Angel, Oregon, inviting them to come to the archdiocese where, he said, their life of prayer and teaching could do so much good for souls. The Order was not in a position to accept the invitation at the time but during the following years the correspondence continued until 1939, with the consent of the Holy See, the Bendedictines were able to set up a house in British Columbia. A twenty-four-acre property on Deer Lake, Burnaby, was purchased and the minor seminary opened on September 17th, 1940, under the direction of the Prior, the Very Reverend Eugene Medved, who was supported by six other Benedictine monks and one secular priest. The theological work of the major seminary was added in 1951. During the Christmas holidays, 1954, the seminary moved to its splendid new location above Mission City, although the buildings then under construction were not completed until 1957.

Reference has already been made to the beginnings of a Methodist College. Four Methodist ministers had arrived in Victoria early in 1859, and by 1886 the church had grown large enough to justify the organization of the British Columbia Conference. Five years later, in 1891, the Education Committee of Conference reported that there was

> a pressing need for an academy or college for the education of the youth of both sexes, and that the time has come when steps should be taken for the establishment of such an institution under the auspices of the Methodist Church. We therefore recommend the appointment of a committee to collect information, formulate a scheme, and take such action as may be deemed best . . .[6]

5. "Letters, Documents, Reveal Foundation of S.C.K.," by Wilfred Sowerby, O.S.B., *Pax Regis*, Vol. XVI, No. 1, January, 1957, p. 5. Most of the information concerning Roman Catholic theological education is derived from this source.

6. Minutes, The British Columbia Conference, The Methodist Church (1891), p. 22.

A committee was appointed consisting of the Reverend John F. Betts, President of the Conference; the Reverend E. Robson; the Reverend C. Watson; the Reverend John Jessop; and Messrs. T. R. Pearson and George R. Ashwell.

At the Conference of the following year the committee reported that the establishment of a College would involve an expenditure of a little more than seven thousand dollars for the first year of its operation, roughly two-thirds of which would be received from students' fees and other sources.[7] The report also contained a recommendation that the College "be established and open for work, if possible, in September next," that is, in 1892. The Reverend Robert Whittington, M.A., B.Sc., was appointed as Principal, premises were rented in New Westminster, and the institution was incorporated by Act of the Provincial Legislature early in 1893 as *Columbian Methodist College*. By 1894 it was reported that there were eighty-five students, including seven probationers or candidates for the ministry of whom it was said that "their presence has had a most beneficial effect on the College, there having been a gracious, religious, influence throughout the year."[8] Columbian College was affiliated with the University of Toronto, and in addition to its work in Theology was able to present a full Arts course even before the establishment of the Provincial University. Toronto degrees were conferred on those who successfully completed the course.

Early in the present century the Presbyterian Church realized the need of a Theological College in British Columbia, and the first recorded step was taken by the Presbytery of Westminster on September 5th, 1905, when a committee was set up to consider the cost and possible location of such an institution.[9] On February 22nd, 1906, the Presbytery of Kamloops passed a resolution setting forth the needs of the mission fields and the great expansion of church work in the west, and asking the Synod to approach the General Assembly with the request that it consider the advisability of setting up a theological college in the province.[10] This resolution was presented to the Synod of British Columbia and Alberta in May, 1906. The Synod transmitted it without comment to the General Assembly, but asked the Presbyteries within its jurisdiction to give the matter further study.[11]

At the meeting of the Synod in 1907 further resolutions were presented from the Presbyteries of Victoria and Westminster, as a result of which an urgent resolution was addressed to the General Assembly declaring the immediate establishment of a Theological College in British Columbia to be

7. Minutes, The British Columbia Conference, The Methodist Church (1892), pp. 29–30.

8. Report of the College Committee, Minutes, The British Columbia Conference, The Methodist Church (1894), p. 36.

9. *Vancouver Province*, September 6th, 1905.

10. *Commemorative Review of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches in British Columbia*, E. A. Davis (Ed.). (Joseph Lee, Vancouver, 1925), pp. 251–2.

11. Minutes of the Fifteenth Synod of British Columbia and Alberta of the Presbyterian Church in Canada (Vancouver, May, 1906), p. 16.

intimately connected with the welfare of the Church in the Province.[12] The location of the College, it was felt, could well be left to the judgment of the General Assembly. A committee appointed by that body reported to the 1907 sessions endorsing the proposal. In support of their recommendations the committee said that there were already fourteen young men in British Columbia who had offered themselves as candidates for the ministry and that the Presbytery of Westminster had given assurance of financial support. The committee also offered the novel, but practical, suggestion that the college should have a summer session rather than the usual winter one. By this means faculty members of other Colleges could be used, and the students themselves would be free to undertake mission work during the winter months. The report was adopted and the decision made to establish a College in Vancouver which would begin its work in April, 1908.[13] A board of management and a senate were appointed to put the plans into effect.

The first step towards the establishment of the College was the appointment of a Principal. It would appear that the matter was discussed informally after which two members of the Board, the Reverend J. M. Millar and the Reverend J. A. McGillivray, journeyed east early in 1908 and called upon the Reverend John MacKay, Minister of Crescent Street Church, Montreal, with a view to interesting him in the appointment. At a meeting held on their return it was agreed "to issue a circular letter to the Presbyterian Church in Canada announcing the nomination by the Board and Senate of the College of the Rev. John MacKay of Crescent Street Church, Montreal,"[14] as Principal. The details of the appointment were evidently completed very quickly for Dr. MacKay was in Vancouver to take his place at the next meeting of the Board a scant three weeks later.[15] Arrangements were also being made to assemble a teaching staff for the forthcoming session. Several of the lecturers were local ministers[16] but because of the summer term the College was able to avail itself of the services of outstanding scholars as visiting professors. During the next few years these included such men as J. E. MacFadyen, of the University of Glasgow, in the field of Old Testament studies; Shailer Matthews, of the University of Glasgow and George Milligan of Glasgow, both New Testament scholars, and John T. McNeill, who was just beginning to build his reputation in Church History.

12. Minutes of the Sixteenth Synod of British Columbia of the Presbyterian Church in Canada (New Westminster, May, 1907), pp. 13–14.

13. Resolution of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, Montreal, June 13th, 1907. Copy in the Minutes, Board of Governors, Westminster Hall. Archives of Union College, Vancouver.

14. Minutes of the Board of Governors, Westminster Hall (hereafter cited as Minutes, Westminster Hall), March 5th, 1908.

15. Minutes, Westminster Hall (March 28th, 1908).

16. Minutes, Westminster Hall (March 28th, 1908). The ministers are listed as follows: Homiletics—Dr. T. W. Taylor; Pastoral Theology—J. A. Logan; Church Law and Procedure—Dr. Robert Campbell; English Bible—J. A. Gillam; Junior Hebrew—J. K. Wright; Arts Subjects—Lemuel Robertson and William Burns.

Arrangements had been made as early as September, 1907, for the College to use the buildings of the Royal Institution for the Advancement of Learning, better known as McGill University College of British Columbia, but in April, 1908, the premises of Queen's School, a girls' private school, at 1600 Barclay Street, Vancouver, were purchased for the college which now became known as Westminster Hall.[17]

The first session opened as planned in April, 1908, with four theological students—a figure which rose to seventeen during the first three years. The acquisition of the Queen's School property made it possible for the college to function throughout the year, and so in September, 1908, a winter session was established to provide a matriculation course for intending candidates who lacked the necessary general education.

A senate was appointed for the College in 1908, and Principal MacKay was inducted to his office on July 2nd of the same year.[18] Provision was also made for the legal incorporation of the college which was secured by the *Westminster Hall Act, 1908*. A true Scots note came out of the minutes of the Board meeting in April, 1909, when it was noted that the fees paid for incorporation had been remitted. At the same meeting it was announced that Captain J. J. Logan, a good friend of the college, had offered to endow a Chair of Practical Theology.[19] His generous proposal was accepted with enthusiasm and the post offered to the Reverend George C. Pidgeon, Minister of Victoria Church, Toronto Junction. Mr. Pidgeon accepted the appointment and began his work in 1910.

By this time the talk of establishing a Provincial University had been revived and the site at West Point Grey where the university now stands had been set apart for it. It was generally agreed that when the university did materialize the theological colleges should be as close to it as possible. With this in mind the Reverend J. A. McGillivray reported to the Board in September, 1910, that he had made application "to the Minister of Education for a grant of land from three to five acres on the University Site at Point Grey."[20]

At the beginning of the 1919 session it was announced that Dr. MacKay, Principal of the Hall since its inception, had accepted the Principalship of Manitoba College, Winnipeg. He agreed, however, to remain until the end of the session and in October of the same year the Reverend W. H. Smith, Ph.D., D.D., was appointed to succeed him.

Two further significant changes remained for Westminster Hall. In 1922 its governing body entered into an agreement with the Anglican and Metho-

17. Minutes, Westminster Hall (April 9th, 1908).

18. Minutes, Westminster Hall, July 2nd, 1908. The members of the Senate were: Principal MacKay, chairman; Revs. A. J. McGillivray, J. K. Wright, J. M. Millar, G. A. Wilson, J. T. Ferguson, J. D. Gillam, W. L. Gray, H. W. Fraser, R. J. Wilson, and J. Campbell; and Messrs. Lemuel Robertson, George Robinson, W. Burns, T. A. Brough, J. C. Brown, Justice Morrison, R. McNair, and the Reverend J. A. Logan.

19. Minutes, Westminster Hall (April 8th, 1909).

20. Minutes, Westminster Hall (September 29th, 1909). The date is evidently erroneous and should be 1910.

dist Colleges for a plan of co-operation in theological teaching with the result that in 1923 the summer session was abandoned in favour of the more usual winter term running from October to April. Then, on June 10th, 1925, Westminster Hall entered the newly formed United Church of Canada, and soon afterwards merged with Ryerson College to form the Union College of British Columbia.

The proposal to create a provincial university, and more particularly its connexion with McGill,[21] was a matter of grave concern to the authorities of Columbian College who feared that their own affiliation with the University of Toronto might be jeopardized in the process. In 1910, therefore, the British Columbia Conference of the Methodist Church was asked "to appoint . . . a strong and representative committee to consider and guard the interests of our Church in relation to the proposed Provincial University, and that this committee be given power to act in all matters affecting the same, where, in its judgment, action is imperative."[22] The committee so appointed met in Wesley Church, Vancouver, on March 30th, 1911, and came to the conclusion that the theological work hitherto carried on at Columbian College should be transferred to a suitably equipped theological college at Point Grey.[23] It recommended that the new college be quite separate from the older college, that it be established under a new charter, and that the choice of its name could very well be left to its own Board of Governors. The proposal was endorsed by the Conference in the next year and also by the General Conference on October 4th, 1911, which appointed a Board of Governors whose officers were to be: W. H. Malkin, Chairman; J. A. Harvey, K.C., Vice-Chairman; R. W. Harris, K.C., Treasurer; and the Reverend E. W. Stapleford, B.A., Secretary. The new college was named "after Rev. Egerton Ryerson, D.D., who did so much for education and religious freedom in the early days of Canadian Methodism."[24] After considering the appointment to the Principalship the Board came to the conclusion that it should be offered to the General Superintendent of the Methodist Church, the Reverend S. D. Chown, with the suggestion that he move to Vancouver and for the present at least retain the Superintendency as well. Dr. Chown agreed to come to Vancouver and to do what he could for the new Ryerson College but declined the Principalship. He took up residence in October, 1912. The real work of promotion seems to have been carried on by Stapleford who, within a year or so, had raised $210,000 towards the proposed buildings, suggested drawings for which appeared in the *Western Methodist Recorder* in June, 1912. The

21. The story of the early days of the University of British Columbia, and of the part played by McGill University in its foundation are described by Colonel H. T. Logan, in his book, *Tuum Est: A History of the University of British Columbia.*

22. Minutes, The British Columbia Conference (The Methodist Church, 1910), p. 376.

23. Minutes, the British Columbia Conference (The Methodist Church, 1911), pp. 351–353.

24. Minutes, The British Columbia Conference (The Methodist Church, 1912), pp. 356–359.

College was incorporated by Act of the Provincial Legislature in the same year. With the outbreak of the first Great War all work came to an end and the College remained no more than a name.

In the fall of 1922 the matter was re-opened and it was decided that Ryerson College should begin work in Theology in the fall of the following year. The Reverend J. G. Brown, M.A., was appointed Acting Principal, temporary accommodation was found in Westminster Hall, and classes began in October, 1923. By this time conversations between the Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches were well under way and it was realized that organic union between them would probably be achieved within a few years. In these circumstances it did not seem wise for Ryerson College to embark upon a building programme. In February, 1924, Ryerson was granted affiliation with the University of British Columbia.

A petition for the incorporation of a Congregational College in British Columbia was presented to the Provincial Legislature early in 1914 by Joseph Kenney Unsworth, Willie Dalton, Thomas Duke, and Hermon A. Carson. The necessary act, identical with that of Ryerson College, was passed and received Royal Assent on March 4th, 1914.

The story of Anglican Theological education in British Columbia is complicated by the fact that in the earliest stages there were two colleges in Vancouver representing different theological viewpoints. It had long been hoped, almost since the Church first sent her missionaries to the Pacific coast in the 1850's that a theological college would be established. By the beginning of the present century the Bishop of New Westminster, the Right Reverend John Dart, was talking about such an institution in Synod and elsewhere.[25] With the approach in 1909 of the jubilee of Bishop Hills' consecration, it seemed that the establishment of a theological college might be a fitting way of marking the anniversary. Funds for the purpose were collected, the name, "St. Mark's," was tentatively selected, and consideration was given to the choice of a site, a matter which was made difficult by the fact that no one knew with any degree of certainty where the new provincial university was to be.

Before any action could be taken to put this scheme into effect a small group of Evangelical churchmen, led by the Reverend C. C. Owen, rector of Christ Church, Vancouver, who were suspicious of the allegedly "high church" tendencies of the authorities, had planned and opened what could only be described as a rival college. The Reverend W. H. Vance, M.A., Rector of the Church of the Ascension, Toronto, was appointed Principal; a house was purchased at 1548 Haro Street, Vancouver, and on Friday, October 7th, 1910, Latimer Hall, or Bishop Latimer College as it was sometimes known, was opened.

For a time controversy raged but Latimer flourished. The authorities had no intention of sacrificing their own project but realized that two competing colleges would, to say the least, not be in the best interests of the Church.

25. Proceedings of the Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster (1907), p. 27.

In consequence, a memorandum was drawn up by the Bishops of the Province called *The Plan for Theological Education in the Church of England in the Province of British Columbia*, known afterwards more briefly as *The Plan*.[26] This plan provided for the establishment of an Anglican Theological College with which the two Halls, Latimer and St. Mark's, would be affiliated. The College which was incorporated by Act of the Provincial Legislature in 1915 (amended 1921) was to have a Board of Governors made up of the Bishops of the Province, with clerical and lay representatives from each diocese. The Board was to be responsible for the erection and maintenance of lecture rooms and library, for the appointment of professors in subjects to be taken in common by all students, for example Old Testament and Apologetics, and for the issuing of all diplomas. Each of the affiliated Halls was to be governed by an independent council and would erect its own buildings, collect its own funds in addition to those allotted by the Board of Governors, and employ its own teaching staff.

The second college, St. Mark's Hall, came into being in 1912. Property was purchased at 1249 Davie Street, and the Reverend C. A. Seager, M.A., Rector of Vernon, appointed as Principal. It was opened at the beginning of October with nine students, and was incorporated by the Provincial Legislature in 1913. Latimer had been incorporated previously in 1911.

For the next few years the two Halls continued their separate existence, each with a few students, each struggling to make ends meet financially, each gravely hampered by the Great War of 1914–18. At the end of the war it became apparent to all concerned that difficulties of men and money would not be decreased while the Halls continued to function independently. A new temper was abroad which had little time for denominational differences and less for theological controversies within a single communion. At the first meeting of the Provincial Synod after the war, which was held in January, 1920, the problem was discussed and the feeling expressed that St. Mark's and Latimer Halls should be more closely unified. The committee appointed to study the matter came to the conclusion that they should not only be unified but amalgamated to function as a single institution. The idea was endorsed, and may even have been suggested, by a joint resolution presented to the committee by the students of the two Halls, many of whom were men returned from military service. As a result of these recommendations Latimer and St. Mark's Halls ceased to exist as separate colleges and were merged in the Anglican Theological College of British Columbia. The chapel belonging to St. Mark's Hall was moved to Haro Street, and the property at 1249 Davie Street was sold. The original Latimer Hall had been enlarged and soon after the amalgamation the property next door at 1542 Haro Street was purchased. The College continued its work in these premises until the opening of the present building on the university campus in 1927.

26. Copy in the files of the Anglican Theological College of British Columbia, Vancouver.

It remains to discuss the matter of co-operation between the various colleges, and their relationships with the provincial university. By the outbreak of war in 1914 there were four institutions involved in this connexion, Westminster Hall (Presbyterian) founded in 1908, Latimer Hall (Anglican) 1910, St. Mark's Hall (Anglican) 1912, and Ryerson College (Methodist) which came into being on paper in 1912.

At the first meeting of the Board of Governors of Ryerson College it was resolved that "it is desirable to enter into negotiations with the other Christian bodies of the Province with a view to the establishment of a common Divinity Hall in affiliation with the University of British Columbia, and that a committee be appointed to carry on such negotiations and to report to this Board."[27] The invitation issued to other communions resulted in a meeting in Sixth Avenue Methodist Church, Vancouver, on January 22nd, 1911, with Anglican, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian representatives present. The Baptists withdrew but the remaining bodies discussed matters of building and curriculum. It was agreed that they should confer with the provincial government to see if a common heating and lighting plant for all the theological colleges in the university would be possible. It was also agreed to ask if a theological department of the university library could be estblished which would accept the recommendations of members of the college faculties. In addition, it was believed "possible to co-operate in teaching in certain subjects, for example, missions and comparative religion, religious psychology and pedagagy, the art of speaking and sociology."[28] Because of plans already made in connexion with the Anglican Theological College the authorities of Latimer Hall found it impossible to co-operate in the matter of buildings but Westminster and Ryerson decided to pursue their scheme by adopting the same form of architecture for their buildings, and by erecting them in the form of a quadrangle. Concerning this, Principal MacKay, of Westminster Hall, wrote in May, 1912:

> The plan is to adopt the quadrangle style of building and have one architect draw up a plan for a large quadrangle containing all the buildings that will ever be required by the two colleges. At present each of the denominations will build one side of the quadrangle which shall contain offices for the staff, three class rooms which can be used later for common rooms, dining room and kitchen, and dormitories to accommodate eighty men. These will be built of stone and enduring material in such a way as to last from six hundred to a thousand years if nothing unforeseen occurs. Later, when both Churches are ready for it, other buildings can be added to complete the plan.
>
> If the Churches should unite organically, a fine library building, a dining hall and a class room building will be added, thus making a quadrangle of great beauty and efficiency as well. When this is done the building now being erected will be used as dormitories only, and will accommodate about one hundred men.

27. Minutes, The British Columbia Conference (The Methodist Church, 1912), pp. 356–359.

28. "The College and the Man," by the Rev. E. W. Stapleford, B.A., *British Columbia Magazine*, Vol. VIII, No. 11 (November, 1912), pp. 789–791.

It is also designed that it can be lengthened to accommodate twice as many men if need be without in any way changing the part already erected and without wasting a dollar.[29]

With this plan in mind, in February, 1913, " a strong deputation representing the Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist Churches waited upon the Provincial Government with the request that 25 acres of land be set aside at Point Grey for the educational work of the three Churches concerned . . ."[30] Fifteen acres of this were to be made up of the grants of five acres which the government had promised to each communion, and the members of the deputation expressed themselves as willing to purchase the other ten acres on reasonable terms.

Because of the outbreak of war nothing further was done about co-operation in teaching, but in 1922 Dr. S. D. Scott, chairman of the Board of Governors of Ryerson College, suggested to the authorities of Westminster Hall and the Anglican Theological College that the subject should be reconsidered. Accordingly, a meeting was held at Wesley Church on April 18th, 1922, attended by representatives of the three colleges, and at which the following resolutions were passed:

1. That this meeting expresses its desire to co-operate where possible in the work of theological education,
2. That we approve of co-operation along the general lines of the Montreal plan and recommend it for approval to our respective boards.
3. That the above two resolutions be referred to the constituent bodies and we request that if accepted a committee be appointed for further consideration.[31]

These decisions were discussed by the Boards of the three colleges; each made its own study of the matter; and in 1923 a system of co-operation in theological teaching was introduced. It was natural that the co-operation between Westminster Hall and Ryerson College should be closer than that between those institutions and the Anglican Theological College, but in the early years co-operation between all three colleges included Biblical Studies, Sociology, Apologetics, and Missions.

From the beginning the value of affiliation with the provincial university has been fully appreciated, and each college in turn has applied for and received affiliation, Westminster Hall and the Anglican Theological College in 1922, Ryerson College in 1924, and Union College after the amalgamation of Westminster and Ryerson in 1927. Affiliation brings to the collegs both tangible and intangible benefits and also enables the colleges to make some contribution to the life of the university as well. The tangible benefits are representation on the senate of the university through which each college has a voice in academic affairs, and the provision made by the

29. *Westminster Hall Magazine*, Vol. 1, no. 12 (May, 1912), pp. 19–20.
30. Minutes, The British Columbia Conference (The Methodist Church, 1913), pp. 370–374.
31. Copy of the minutes in the files of the Anglican Theological College of British Columbia, Vancouver.

university for theological options which means that any registered student of an affiliated theological college may present certain courses taken in the college for credit towards the Bachelor of Arts degree. The intangible benefits are more difficult to define. They would include a little of the reflected glory of the university. Obviously the academic reputation of a smaller institution tends to be overshadowed by that of its larger neighbour and for the colleges this has been, on the whole, beneficial. There is also the contact between minds at both faculty and student levels, together with opportunities to enjoy the facilities of the university. One of the most significant of these is the use of the university library. As an indication of the reality of this co-operation it may be noted that the library of one of the colleges, the Anglican Theological College, is now in process of being integrated with the university library. Separate libraries are maintained but the card catalogue of each contains all the theological works in the other—a very real help both to theological and university students.

On the other side the presence of the theological colleges in the university makes its own contribution. The colleges stand for a measure of Christian conviction in a society where agnosticism and secularism are sometimes apparent. The students of the colleges mix with those of other faculties and are thereby called upon to defend their faith and bear a Christian witness. The faculties of the colleges also take their place with those of the university in fostering student relationships and, more recently, in teaching courses in religious studies.

In this way theological education which sprang from very small beginnings in British Columbia has grown to be an integral part of the system of higher education in the province.

Soul Care in the Ministry of Jesus (I)

GEORGE JOHNSTON

About twenty years ago Henry Cadbury published a book with the title, *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*. Quite rightly he warned his readers not to make Jesus into a twentieth-century American or a British Tory or a socialist Russian. For Jesus was a Jew of Galilee who wore sandals and perhaps a white robe, who worked for some years in the building trade, whose entire outlook on life was determined mostly by the religion of the Old Testament, certain influences contemporary with himself, and also his own secret spiritual experiences. Jesus was born long before Galileo and Darwin, Einstein and Hoyle; he was ignorant of Freud's *id* and Adler's *inferiority complex* and the other discoveries of modern psychology. It will not do therefore to idealize Jesus as the eternal contemporary.

Cadbury admits, however, that one may go too far in this direction, and a recent volume by Sherman Johnson, *Jesus in His Homeland*, might well be consulted in order to redress the balance. Jesus was not just a conventional Jew of the first century. He was an outstanding personality, possessing his own genius, who was in certain respects a rebel. Therefore one should try to see in him also what belongs to him universally as "man" and not merely as "Jew." If one begins by dismissing him as old-fashioned and outdated, one will be compelled by the same procedure to debunk Plato, the Buddha, St. Augustine, St. Francis, John Wesley, or any other spiritual giant of the past. Genuine worth and wisdom will not begin in the thirtieth century nor in our own. Bishop Runestam has written that the criticism of Jesus as ignorant of modern psychology means that "He was confused in reference to what is in man," and it is "to recommend a salvation different from that of the Christian." The anthropology and psychology of the New Testament are, he asserts, "God's Law and God's Gospel," and so far as Christian soul care is concerned these must be of decisive importance. We must constantly keep in view what is the basic Christian concept of human nature, and especially "what Jesus Christ intends for man."[1] This is well said by an expert in his field, though perhaps it does not sufficiently recognize the real contribution that psychology has rendered and may still render to theology and to spiritual living.

No apology is required, then, for considering soul care in the ministry of Jesus with a view to learning from it for the pastoral ministry today. We believe in Jesus Christ as the Revealer of God, who created men for his own purpose of good; as the Saviour of sinners and their eternal Hope. In

1. *Psychoanalysis and Christianity*, pp. 177–179.

the Gospels we find that Jesus is presented under several titles, each significant for his supreme importance. He is the Son of God, the true messianic King of Israel, but also the only-begotten of God the Father. He is the Son of Man who was humiliated and shall be glorified. He is the eternal *Logos* or Word, the agent of creation, who became flesh to bring the grace and truth of God uniquely to earth. He is Lord, One who was raised from the dead; and he is Emmanuel, God with us.

These high theological descriptions never divorce his Person from the work he did and does for his disciples. As Son, he makes them members of God's family; as *Logos*, he states the meaning of God, the Judge and Rewarder of men, and the meaning of life. He is also man's representative, their High Priest, who was made like his brethren, knows their weaknesses, and was himself subject to temptation, sorrow, poverty, and at last death. Here then is a Jew who is not only by sheer miracle the *locus* of the divine Spirit in a human life, but also by equal miracle of personal identification a Friend and Elder Brother. How he did his work must have much to say to his ministers.

John 10 gives answer in the allegory of the Good Shepherd. The same title is employed in 1 Peter 2:25. "Shepherd," it should be noted, has a wider range of meaning in Biblical speech than the pastoral. To say that God is the Shepherd of Israel means that he is its sovereign, guide, and defender. Jesus as the shepherd has provided under-shepherds for the Flock of God (cf. Acts 20: 28f., 1 Peter 5:2) and has left them an example (John 13:15). He called and commissioned disciples even during the historic ministry, to share his work in its triple aspect: namely, to preach, to heal, and to forgive sins (Mark 3:14–19; 6:7–13; John 20:21–23).

First of all, then, *Jesus was a teaching preacher.*

It is no accident that this was so. The narrative of the great Temptations (Luke 4:1–13 and par.) suggests that Jesus had to consider the current conceptions of the Messiah's work and that he rejected them. He would not be a second Moses (cf. Acts 3: 22) who would feed bread (or manna) to the People of God in the wilderness; although we read that once, out of compassion, he did assemble them for a desert banquet and as a result they tried to force his hand and make him their king (John 6:15). He would not be another prophet-priest like Elijah, who would suddenly appear as the messenger of the covenant (Malachi 3:1) to take charge of the Temple and its liturgy; although we read that he did try to cleanse the Temple courts and as a result was quickly arrested and put to death. Nor would he be the new David (the Son of David) of popular acclaim who would win an empire mightier than Solomon's or that of Tiberius, for the price to be paid would be servile adoration of the Devil. Thus a religion of legalism, or one that is dependent on the sacrifice of goats and calves (cf. Hebs. 9:12–14), or one that takes the sword in order to conquer, is excluded; and Christ's ministers in their pastoral office too must beware of any methods that really belong to such forms of religion.

What then did Jesus choose to do in his own fulfilment of the messianic hope? He chose a "ministry," a "service"; and it began with teaching and preaching (Mark 1:14; 2:13; 6:6; 9:31).

Now the teacher in Judaism in the lifetime of Jesus was often a scribe, an adherent of the party of the Pharisees, whose method was to interpret the divine *Torah* or Law with the help of many "authorities." Or, like the "Right Teacher" of Qumran, he might provide interpretations of Old Testament prophecies that made them suit his own conditions. Jesus astonished the synagogue congregation at Capernaum because he had "authority," a word that probably indicates direct communion with God and an original mind.

Again, the true teacher, in the ancient world as in the modern, was one with patience to persevere with persons, and his message must be persuasive rather than "sophistical." Clearly, Jesus made immediate contact with most people, in the synagogue, on the hillside, at the lakeside where crowds used to besiege him. He also gave time to individuals. Mary, the sister of Martha, hung on his words. He spoke directly to Levi, to Zaccheus, and to others. Above all, he took the Twelve apart to be with him and be taught.

As teacher also Jesus was a story-teller whose parables sprang from the common life and betray a man who knew the daily life of the land. The parables "reveal a definite personal character, a unique clarity and simplicity, a matchless mastery of construction."[2] His stories compelled self-examination and teased out of people the answers to their own queries (cf. Luke 10:36). "Jesus would not, and could not, do their thinking for them. He could show them what to look at. He could paint them pictures in words and show them signs in action. But they alone could take the next step. They could see whether they were in the picture or still be waiting for an explanation."[3]

This teaching method justifies the conclusion that Jesus was gracious to men and women, keenly observed their motives and behaviour, and was prepared to be spent in helping them. That is to say, the teaching was not remote, it was his pastoral work in action. It required patience and hard work, but because he gave it both, he came to know what is in man (John 2:25). It enabled him to see inside Simon the Pharisee, the penitent publican, and Levi the tax collector (Luke 7:36ff., 18:9ff.; Mark 2:14).

When we turn to the content of the teaching, we see that it combined elements of praise and blame, hope and judgment; this Teacher was no sissy!

The good news (Mark 1:14f.; cf. Acts 10:36) was that God was triumphing over principalities and powers of evil (Mark 3:23ff.). Jews in that day, like people in our own time, were burdened with anxieties and doubts about basic issues; and particularly about such things as the Roman occupation, heavy taxes, sickness, and insanity. As a nation pledged to the

2. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, p. 10.
3. T. Ralph Morton, *The Twelve Together*, p. 80.

covenant of Yahweh and separated from Gentile dogs and Samaritan half-breeds, they were under discipline, they knew the meaning of sin, of debts due to God, of moral uncleanness. In the desert of Judea men like the Qumran covenanters and John the Baptist summoned them to repentance and a new manner of life (cf. 1QH, the *Thanksgiving Poems*, 4:30f.; 6: 9–13; 7:28–30). When Jesus came, he too talked about sin and repentance, divine grace and love, "came with the message of God's antecedent forgiveness,"[4] as we read in Mark 2:9f., Luke 15, 18. The yoke Jesus offered was easy and his burden light (Matt. 11:30).

Yet there was another, disturbing note in his teaching, which people found hard to take, new wine that demanded new wineskins (Mark 2:22). The result was conflict over many aspects of religious duty (Mark 2:16; 3:6; 7:9–13; 11:27–33; 12:13–40). Of his own followers he required tolerance, humility and gentleness, and he said terrible words like these: "If your hand causes you to sin, cut it off . . ." (Mark 9:33–48). He called for self-denial and for courage in the face of persecution, because he knew full well the world in which selfish greed and ambition rule.

Those who would walk in his way as pastors must take into account the realism of Jesus as well as his tenderness. It is not enough to say with Calkins in his book, *Jesus and People*, that the Lord was gracious, sympathetic, and loving; or that he showed moral and spiritual power. It is not adequate to analyse his method as one marked by observation, a leisurely approach and detachment, attention to one problem at a time, and a belief in people. It was also, as Dr. Calkins does see, a demanding method; for it was urgent business that Jesus had undertaken. He came as God's servant in the crisis of all time, yet he failed at Nazareth and had to retreat from Galilee because people would not understand or insisted on a worldly and materialist Kingdom. Jesus had to face the depths of evil in the heart of man (Mark 7:21–23) and ultimately to accept rejection and crucifixion (Mark 8: 31–36). What is more, he called his disciples too to walk the road to the cross, so that Christianity came to conjoin happiness and despair, assurance and hope, pessimism about the bondslaves of pride and evil, optimism about the power of God to raise the dead and create new heavens and a new earth. Nevertheless, even if one rise from the dead, there are those who will not believe; even with the Old Testament completed in the New, they will not believe (cf. Luke 16: 31). Hence the pastor must watch and beware, for the End is not known (Mark 13:32), and the lessons of the past advise him that many are found wanting when the crises happen (Luke 13:1–5). Preachers who are teachers and pastors (and they must be both, to be worth their salt) have to do justice to the elements of grace and judgment in the Gospel account of Jesus, their example.

The preacher, of course, labours under the trial that he is himself subject to infirmity and sin and he must be ever ready to speak to his own condition.

4. S. E. Johnson, *Jesus in His Homeland*, p. 72.

But it is important to stress here the fact that regular preaching is an essential aspect of the cure of souls. The old Scots worthy who said to the young pulpiteers of his time, "Wherever you start in the Scriptures, make across country as quickly as possible to Jesus Christ," should have added this: "Make across country to the life of your own day and the actual needs of your own people." Isabel Cameron tells the story of Colin Chisholm who came long ago to Glen Annat in Scotland. "I have been in college for five years," he told Miss Rosemary Leigh, "and now I am come to teach and to preach." "And I do suppose they teach *everything* in the college, Mr. Colin Chisholm?" replied the young beauty, with mischief in her eyes.[5] Before long the minister found that he must preach about witchcraft and evil doings by night in the parish; he had to teach the doctrine of election in such a way that it could never justify the hypocrisies of his ruling elder, Magnus MacLeod of Ravensrock. He had much to learn about women, and he had to take into the manse the forlorn and the sick. So is it in Canada today. Woe betide the preacher who says that he has no time for pastoral visiting, and who employs a retired man to be his substitute! Woe betide the minister who accepts the view of some Americans that his duty nowadays is to be the "director" of the parish team, as though he were a business manager with an important plant to run, executives to train, and a budget to raise! A preacher in the mode of Jesus must also be a pastor.

Thus he will bring comfort to the dispirited and good news of the mercy of God, two notes that George F. MacLeod has said he would emphasize, if he had his early ministry to do over again. He will also need to be outspoken, in charity and humility, but bravely like John Knox on the social and political issues of the day. For he is the servant of God and the servant of men.

His work will be done in a variety of ways: with individuals, with small groups, and in the great congregation. Preaching over the heads of the folk will have no pastoral relevance. Preaching may have poetry and a spice of humour in it, for the same reason. He must, of course, be free with men and women in such a way that he is accepted as a man of God and yet not repulsed because he lacks sympathy. It may have been unfair criticism, but it was devastating, that "what the Rev. Mr. A. needs is a public relations man to go ahead and meet people for him."

This leads to the point that ministers who are faithful must expect criticisms of many kinds, for they need not look for easy successes. The New Testament makes no pretence that principalities and powers of evil have closed up shop since Easter.

Finally, it may be stressed that the pastor who is preacher and teacher should be ready to speak with something of the same authority as Jesus himself. That is to say, he is not set amongst his flock to be merely a second-hand reporter or a retailer of old truths. He should be able to say with Job: "I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye sees thee"

5. *The Street of the Spinners*, p. 30.

(Job 42: 5; cf. John 9: 25; 1 John 1:1–3). There has to be a first-hand witness. At the same time, the pastor may have to teach in a situation where some individual needs reassurance, and it will hardly do for him to strike a wavering and uncertain note. He needs the wisdom that is sure of Jesus Christ but not dogmatic in the popular meaning of that word. Mysteries and problems remain, in spite of the Christian revelation. And yet the people who look up to the pulpit hope to be fed, not with theological arguments whereby the preacher is trying to convince himself or out-shout his antagonist, but rather with the devout faith and confidence of those who have seen the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Few are given the grace to be authentic prophets of the Word, but all may aspire to speak a prophetic word by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit; else would Christian preaching be reduced to the level of the scribe and the pedantic exegete. It is by virtue of his call by Christ in his Church that the preaching pastor, seeking to walk in the steps of Jesus, should have words of authority to say to the congregation to help, assure, surprise, convict, inspire and teach.

(A second article will follow.)

The Universities and Religious Studies

JOHN S. CONWAY

Recently in Canada, several universities have established or extended departments of Religious Studies. In this article, the author explores the academic, rather than the theological, arguments in favour of such a process.

THE history of the relations between the University and the Church is long and intimate. Not only did the earliest Universities spring from the Church's concern for learning and the training of the young, but even today the character of the universities of the Western world is inexplicable without reference to the Christian Church. Innumerable ideas and forms in University thought and practice testify to the connection. The division of the University into different faculties, the organization of lectures, the system of examinations and the methods of conferring degrees, as well as such matters as academic dress, demonstrate the long tradition of associations by which History has linked the Church and the University together.

More profoundly, both the University and the Church have shared a common belief in the importance of the pursuit of truth and learning for their own sakes. This is as true in the earliest universities, founded under the Church's auspices, as in the newer foundations, sponsored by secular authorities. The resolute determination to defend and maintain freedom of enquiry and of teaching now unites all the universities of the Western World. Because of the particular importance of the University in modern society, it would seem especially necessary that these ideals should be an accepted and inherent part of the university life, and that the University should actively sponsor their recognition and dissemination. Despite the enormous pressure from added academic disciplines, and from ever larger enrolments, the University would be failing in its task if it were not concerned for the maintenance of the spiritual values it has inherited.

For these reasons, both historical and ideological, it is fitting that, as part of its wider responsibility for the appropriation, improvement and transmission of our intellectual and cultural heritage, the University should cherish its own Christian background and origins, caring as much for the ideas upon which it depends as for the buildings which enfold them. Ways and means should be found and encouraged for making the University aware of its own tradition and its *raison d'être*. Furthermore, the University has another entirely proper function, which is to bring alive for its members their own traditions. And since the students of Canadian universities are in the main brought up in the Judaic-Hellenistic-Christian traditions, the

University should seek to bring alive these traditions, and to give students a fuller awareness of the great inheritance into which they have entered.

For its part, the Church, as we were recently reminded in a report to the Canadian Council of Churches, "has an essential contribution to make to the undergirding of the intellectual life of the University. It will uphold the integrity of the University, its freedom to fulfil its own function, and its duty to contribute towards the building of a responsible and just social order. It will seek to contribute to the growth of those truly human relations in the University which are essential for the health and wholeness of any community."

In the early universities, no subject was held more deserving of study than that of God's dealings with Man, and for that reason they made theology the queen of sciences. If, in this secular age, other disciplines appear to take pre-eminence, this does not rule out the validity of the study of this part of man's thought and experience. Indeed, the twentieth century has seen a remarkable growth of discoveries and research in the field of Religious Studies, which has added greatly to the sum of human thought and knowledge, and which has been largely sponsored by universities. The academic reputation of such men as Schweitzer, Barth, Niebuhr, Buber, Tillich, Dodd, Aulen or Gilson, is world-wide. It may well be claimed, therefore, that a department of Religious Studies could offer a course of studies as deep and as penetrating as any other in the university. Such a department would be able to attract students beyond the undergraduate level, for there is a growing demand among graduate students for courses in Religious Studies to complement and complete their work in related fields, such as history, psychology or education. Furthermore, Extension Departments have found that there is a substantial enrolment in the field of Religious Studies, arising out of interest sparked by such events as the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Again, it may be pointed out that there is a serious lack of advanced study and research in Religious Studies throughout English-speaking Canada. It is surely not too much to claim that if this branch of learning were given a larger place in university curricula, and accorded a larger share of academic resources, notable contributions could be made.

In the past, difficulty has been experienced in drawing up syllabi for undergraduate courses, which, while giving a worth-while content, will not fall into the danger of stressing the contribution too strongly of any one denomination or faith. Yet it would appear that many universities have been able to solve this problem, by stressing the academic rather than the apologetic nature of such courses. The more detailed the course, the less likelihood there is of misunderstanding.

From the wider point of view of the desirability of strengthening the awareness of our spiritual inheritance, it should be stressed how important, often how crucial, is the experience of students while at University. It cannot be claimed that students come to the University with mature understanding of their faith, partly because of their own immaturity, partly

because of inadequate instruction. In this situation, the University should encourage or make available the facilities by which students may be shown the possibility of acquiring an intellectually mature understanding of their faith. This is a peculiar responsibility within the University because this is the place where students sometimes attempt to put their faith in a watertight compartment far removed from all intellectual activities, or drift into a state of indifference where religion loses its significance, or live in a state of unresolved tension and despair. To guard against such dangers, and, perhaps more importantly, to make adequate provision for the moral and mental equipment of the whole man, universities should strive to be places where men and women can find provision for such needs. If there is to be growth in the character as well as in the minds of students, then universities must be places where opportunities and facilities for growth exist. For example, universities should encourage the visit of important speakers to talk on subjects of religious interest, as they do for speakers on political or academic topics.

Above all, it is necessary that the University be a place where ultimate questions are taken seriously. What might be described as the prophetic function of the University should not be forgotten. Like the Church, the University has a responsibility to remind its members and its community of the values for which it stands. It can hardly do this unless the public discussion of such ideas is encouraged.

Rightly or wrongly, members of the academic community are apt to assess the importance of things by the amount of intellectual effort put into them. If the University does not consider Religious Studies intellectually important enough to be given a significant place on the academic scene, then there will always remain suspicions of the unintellectual or even anti-intellectual nature of religious belief. It is necessary to show the meaningfulness of spiritual values in terms which the academic community will take seriously, by demonstrating the validity of academic techniques in this field, and through them, the possibility of being both intellectually mature and a believer in religious faith. A department of Religious Studies, by its very existence, can do a great deal to show that religion is a matter, not merely of the emotions, but of the mind. A University ought to be particularly careful to take measures to prevent the growth of the assumption that religion is out-of-date and a matter to be discarded by the enlightened rationalism of modern intellectuals. No better way exists to prevent this than by the intellectual witness of a department of Religious Studies.

Objections will of course be raised. First, it will be argued that the University should not encourage the propagation of particular faiths. This objection may be refuted both by theory and practice. It should be carefully pointed out that the University does not teach Christianity because it is true; the truth of the Christian faith is a proposition to which the University is not in any way committed. The University seeks to enlighten the mind, not to influence the will of the student. It is here merely concerned to study an

area of experience and thought in man's life. Its jealous guardianship of the principle of free enquiry further protects it from teaching or reaching preconceived conclusions.

It may further be objected that such departments of Religious Studies would tend to become merely vocational training schools for the clergy. Such a development would be unwelcome from the points of view both of the Church and of the University. Theological colleges, of necessity, must stress practicality of training, and the individual nature and contribution of their own denomination. Universities should stress the academic approach to, and universal interest of, Religious Studies. Again, in other universities, it has been found that students have taken courses in Religious Studies, who would not be likely to make use of them professionally; for example, in Nottingham University, during the last year, of the thirty-two students reading Honours Theology, seventeen were women.

Finally, there is the question, admittedly difficult, of the personnel for such a department. While in theory it might be desirable to find persons who could teach Religious Studies with complete intellectual objectivity, yet this does not seem practicable. Religion is one of the subjects which cannot be fully comprehended from the outside, and therefore for reasons of academic competence, the possible inference of teaching being inclined to favour one or other denomination should be accepted. So long as the University retains control over the appointments of its own faculty members, and is persuaded of their academic qualifications, this difficulty can surely be resolved, as indeed it already has been at many universities.

The University is the place where the future leaders of society are trained. It may be claimed that a larger and richer concern for the mental and moral equipment of our students will in time be reflected in our society. The University has always maintained that the techniques of teaching and research are its proper methods, through which it contributes to the welfare of society. If such methods could be extended, through the instrumentality of departments of Religious Studies, to make society more aware of its inheritance, to examine the values and ideologies of the day, and to transmit the benefits of rigorous study and research, then Universities could play a still greater part in fashioning the intellectual and moral climate of the country.

Book Reviews

An Outline of Anglo-American Bible History. By Edgar Newgass. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd. (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co. Ltd.), 1958. Pp. 56, Pl. 17. $6.00.

This book cannot be regarded as making any significant contribution to the field of knowledge about the various versions of the Bible in English, but it successfully depicts the importance of the Bible as a major factor in the joint cultural heritage of all English speaking people. The author is not a Biblical scholar but a layman who has made the study of old English Bibles a hobby.

The development of the Bible is traced from Hebrew, Greek and Latin Texts to the Modern Versions of the present. Caedman, a humble herdsman, was the first to render the Scriptures into English and was a forerunner of the Venerable Bede who translated the Gospel of St. John in 735. From this early date the Scriptures were woven into the fabric of English culture. Alfred the Great, who may be regarded as the founder of Britain, translated or caused to be translated parts of the Bible and placed the Ten Commandments at the head of England's laws. During the Middle Ages the Psalms were translated and became the favourite book in England.

In 1382 John Wycliffe, an Oxford scholar, produced the first translation into English of the whole Bible. Wycliffe was a theologian as well as a translator. Both his teaching and his translation of the Bible were subjected to severe condemnation and he was eventually branded as a heretic. His translation which was made from the Vulgate was too stilted in expression for popular acceptance and had little direct influence on subsequent translations. It was the message of the Bible which became known through being rendered in the vernacular rather than the translation itself which made Wycliffe "The Morning Star of the Reformation."

William Caxton was the first to introduce printing into England and among the books he translated and published was the Golden Legend by Jacobus de Voragine. Among the writings contained in this book which had received the Papal blessing were many passages of Scripture, and thus a considerable amount of the Bible was circulated in England without provoking the opposition of those who were opposed to the translation of the Bible into the language of the people.

Even a limited circulation of the Scriptures made the Reformation inevitable for the corruption and superstition of the Medieval Church were in clear contradiction to the truth of the Bible.

The story of William Tyndale with his vision of even "a boy that driveth the plough" as possessing the Bible in his own tongue and of how he eventu-

ally was martyred in Belgium where he had sought refuge from his enemies is one of the great chapters in the story of the English Bible.

Tyndale's dying prayer, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes" was soon answered and within a few brief years Henry VIII permitted the Bible to be freely circulated in the land. In this new atmosphere Myles Coverdale revised Tyndale's translation and his Bible became the first to be freely circulated in England.

The Matthew, the Great, the Genevan and the Bishops Bibles appeared in the years between 1537 and 1568 and prepared the way for the King James Version of 1611. Appearing at a time when the English tongue was at its richest this version has reigned supreme in the English speaking world for over three centuries.

Copies of the Latin Vulgate may have been brought to North America by the Norsemen, but it was not until 1630 when John Winthrop established the Massachusetts Bay Colony that an English Bible arrived on these shores. The first book to be printed in the new world was the Bay Psalm Book which appeared in 1640 in Cambridge, Mass. The first complete Bible was in the dialect of the Massachusetts Indians in 1663, the translation having been made by John Eliot who had also been instrumental in the Bay Psalm Book project.

As fresh source material appeared and as textual criticism developed there was dissatisfaction with the King James Bible on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1885 the English Revised Version was completed to be followed by the American Revised Version in 1901. Again in this century archaeological discoveries have shed new light on both the texts and the language of ancient manuscripts and numerous new versions in English have appeared.

The table of the dates of the English translations affords an easy reference to the 46 principal versions from the year 670 until 1952. A valuable part of the book is the comparison of different translations and the 16 pages of photographs of portions of old Bibles.

The chief defect of this book is that it highlights points of special interest to the author in a way which could be confusing to those for whom it is an introduction to the history of the English Bible. Those who are familiar with the subject will find his fresh approach and his comments on many disputed points interesting.

KENNETH G. MCMILLAN

Toronto, Ontario.

Between God and Satan. By HELMUT THIELICKE, translated by C. C. BARBER. Edinburgh & London: Oliver and Boyd (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co. Ltd.) 1958. Pp. x, 84. $2.50.

THIS IS a very stimulating little book which gives a fresh and relevant interpretation of the temptation in the wilderness. First written in 1938, it was republished after the war and is now made available in English. It bears the marks of the struggle of the Christian faith with Nazism during the

years before World War II. However, its interpretation is not significant for that period only but should speak to Christians of every age.

The author presents his material vividly, and the book is interesting throughout. The contents are valuable both as devotional reading and for their theological insights.

The thesis of Thielicke is that in his temptations, which means in all his life, man is the battleground between God and Satan. This is not a new thought, but it is set forth with a clarity and a lucidity which make this little book a worthy contribution to the literature on the subject of temptation.

The author emphasizes that it is not an external Satan who stands between man and God, but the cause of temptation lies in man. "The secret of temptation lies within ourselves, in the thoughts of our hearts. It lies in the fact that we are 'temptable' " (p. 16).

With full recognition of all that is involved Thielicke seeks to illuminate the experience of temptation by a careful analysis of the experience of our Lord in the wilderness. "He shows you how life can be borne in its most critical and terrible hour—in the hour of temptation" (p. 3).

He goes astray, however, in his interpretation of the fact that our Lord was tempted "like unto us" (p. 18). In Thielicke's interpretation the same desires that lurk in the heart of sinful man were present in the heart of Christ. Surely it was true of Christ in the wilderness as it was later, "—the prince of this world cometh and findeth nothing in me" (John 14:30). The true similarity between Christ and man is in the fact that our Lord had laid aside the prerogatives of his Godhead and faced life with all its temptation as man. His strength was in the power of the Holy Spirit which had descended upon Him (Matth. 3:16; Luke 4:1). It is on this same power that man must rely in his struggle with temptation.

Thielicke also fails to note the place and the work of the Holy Spirit in relation to the word of Scripture. He discusses the difference between our Lord's use of Scripture and Satan's and quite correctly points out that "we can only take God at His word by placing ourselves under and not above the word" (p. 55). But the problem of obedience to the word is not solved as simply as that. It is not enough to say, "The word of God with which Jesus opposes the devil has higher authority solely and exclusively because for him, for Jesus, it represents the authority beneath which he stands" (p. 56). The question still remains why Jesus could not place himself under the authority of the word quoted by the tempter? The answer to that is, and this Thielicke fails to observe, that the word is only authoritative when authenticated by the Holy Spirit.

The three temptations are treated thoroughly and in a way which relates them to the life of today. Busy ministers will find a wealth of material here for homiletical use. Every sub-section title—and there are forty in the book —suggests sermon subjects: e.g. "The Mystery of Temptation; Man as the god of God;" "The Babylonian Heart;" "The Devil on the Basis of the Fact of God." Here is eternal truth in modern garb.

This little book is to be recommended highly for careful study to the parish minister as well as to the New Testament student. It must be read carefully and critically however. Vivid imagination carries the writer astray at times and there are notable theological lapses.

L. De Groot

Montreal

The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. By Paul J. Alexander. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1958. Pp. 287. $7.50.

It is good to know that there are still publishers for monographs of this kind, even though the price tag reminds us that as far as the Oxford Press is concerned, virtue *must* have its reward. The present work concerns a relatively unfamiliar subject: the Iconoclastic controversy and one of its leading protagonists, the Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. As in the case of a great many things Byzantine, the precise character of the Iconoclast movement remains somewhate obscure and mysterious. The attack on religious images began formally in the Byzantine Empire in A.D. 726 under the Emperor Leo III, reaching its ferocious apogee during the reign of the brilliant, if unstable, Constantine V. This period of virulent persecution of image worshippers, monastics especially, was succeeded by a time of quiet, marked by a return to more orthodox attitudes in the reign of the Empress Irene. The Seventh Ecumenical Council (A.D. 787) re-affirmed the theological validity of images and icons. However, there was to be a second period of iconoclastic fervour, lasting well into the ninth century. The Patriarch Nicephorus belongs to the early years of this second period of unrest.

Born in the middle of the eighth century, a bureaucrat by background and training, Nicephorus rose quickly to the position of Imperial Secretary. His early success as a layman, however, seems to have served only to encourage his withdrawal from the world of political intrigue into monasticism. He might have remained in such a dignified retreat had not the Emperor Nicephorus in 806 named him to the see of Constantinople. As patriarch, Nicephorus was deeply involved in the religious and political cross-currents of his day, and it was but natural that when iconoclasm revived in the reign of Leo V he should prove to be one of its first victims. With considerable dignity and strength, Nicephorus refused to abandon the decisions of the Seventh Council. He bowed to the imperial request that he withdraw from his exalted office and died in exile. A man of moderate views and moderate emotions, Nicephorus was also a writer of great talent. Fortunately, a large portion of this monograph is devoted to an exposition of Nicephorus' views on iconoduly and allied theological matters. It would seem that Nicephorus had a scholastic turn of mind which, curiously enough, Alexander interprets as a symptom of religious decline. Be that as it may, it remains clear that Nicephorus was a worthy continuator of the Byzantine theological tradition.

In many respects, the most original part of this study are those sections

which deal with the theories advanced against, and in defence of, image worship. Unfortunately, the pages dealing with the introduction of images into the Christian tradition are marred by a high-flown moralizing, inherited from Bury and Harnack ("the pagan transmutation of Christianity," etc.). It is a pity that Professor Alexander has not read Bevan's *Holy Image*, certainly a better guide towards a sympathetic understanding of this religious development. Central to the Iconoclastic controversy is the problem of origins. Here there is much that is illuminating, but, one fears, illuminating only to those who are thoroughly versed in the problem. Alexander's final opinion seems to be that iconoclasm was a protest movement within Byzantine Christianity, whose roots reach far back into the Christian past, and which received additional strength from those tendencies towards monophysitism which were endemic in the Christian Orient. It seems now to be beyond dispute that iconoclasm in its fully developed phase went hand in hand with a monophysite christology. Thanks to Alexander and many others, we can now see this movement as the final attempt, made by oriental religiosity, to capture the ramparts of eastern Catholicism and to subvert the christological definitions of Chalcedon.

Nonetheless, though its virtues be many, it cannot be denied that this work creates a mixed impression in the reader. There can be only high praise for the sobriety of its presentation. The book is not cluttered with the one-sided judgments and hasty generalizations which distinguished Martin's study of the controversy. There is a great deal of valuable information tucked away in the odd corners of this book, e.g., a more just estimate of the attitudes displayed by the iconodules towards the Papacy, as well as new evidence bearing upon Byzantine relations with the West and the Carolingians. Nevertheless, the total effect is curiously discrete and amorphous. There is great attention to detail but little to over-all design. Much of the material presented is eminently suitable for publication in the form of articles. Yet when put together in the form of a book the effect is rather like washing strung on a line. The work remains therefore difficult to use, to absorb, much less to enjoy.

John Gordon Rowe

Huron College
University of Western Ontario

The Answer to the Whole Set of Questions of the Celebrated Mr. William Apollonius, Pastor of the Church of Middleburg Looking toward the Resolution of Certain Controversies Concerning Church Government Now Being Agitated in England. By John Norton. Trans. from the Latin by D. Horton. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press (Toronto: S. J. Reginald Saunders & Co. Ltd.), 1958. Pp. xxi, 196. $6.25.

This is a translation from the original Latin of the answers which the Rev. John Norton, minister of the Church in Ipswich in New England, provided

to a series of questions submitted to the Independent or Congregational leaders in England during the dying moments of the Westminster Assembly (1648). As Dean Horton in his introduction has indicated, the questions were sent to the five Independent members of the Assembly by the Reformed minister of Middleburg in Holland who was commissioned by some of his Dutch *confrères* to try to win the English Independents back to a more "presbyterian" form of church government. That the answers to the questions might be well and truly given the English recipients of the questionnaire turned the task of formulating a reply over to their New England allies. The result was this work, probably the first American theological treatise directed not merely to England but to the church of western Europe as a whole.

As one reads the book one cannot but be impressed with the fact that the author and his advocates were not a great distance from their Presbyterian brethren. Strongly Calvinistic and "experimental" in their views, they would see eye to eye on most points with Rutherford, Baillie, Gillespie and others. The real point of conflict was over the question of whether any ecclesiastical body larger than "the covenanted congregation" possessed any judicial or legislative authority over church members. To this Norton and his colleagues answered, particularly in the statement *Of Classes and Synods*, with a definite and clear cut, no!

At the same time, however, the New England congregationalists were by no means anabaptist or even Brownite in their attitude. They believed that the holding of synods by representatives of various churches was very necessary in order that matters relating to their common faith might be considered and settled. The answers given to questions concerning the faith by proper synods were then to be binding, but not by virtue of these bodies' ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Rather, it was the fact that they represented the common Christian opinion which gave them their position of influence. In matters of discipline and the ordination of ministers and elders, on the other hand, as an autonomous family, the congregation alone possessed the necessary God-given authority (answers VIII and IX).

Because of this point of view, Norton sets forth a relationship between church and state rather different from that of the English Long Parliament. While denying the magistrate any right to interfere in the church, he contends that as a Christian the magistrate has the responsibility of protecting and aiding "pure religion" without attempting to become an ecclesiastical officer. The basic assumption of the magistrate's Christian character resembles closely that which lies at the very root of Calvin's conception of true Christian political government.

Branching out from this central point one could, if there were space, discuss Norton's tolerance towards "set forms of service" under certain circumstances, his firm rejection of any idea of "orders" apart from election by a congregation and his views on church membership and discipline. But since this is not possible, all a reviewer can say is that it is an extremely interesting and, to one who is a Presbyterian, stimulating book.

From an historical point of view an important aspect of the work is its scholastic method of argumentation. As one reads it, one cannot but be impressed with the fact that Thomist roots are here coming to the surface of the ground in a new guise. Likewise it would seem to be apparent that in these scholastic roots lies hidden much of the fruit which was to come to maturity in the New England unitarianism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Argument based upon a concept of "natural law" rather different from that of let us say, Calvin, appears repeatedly. Thus Norton's work is a useful source in the study of the history of American thought.

From the references contained in the work it is obvious that Norton possessed a well-stocked library of both English and Continental writers. It is interesting to note, however, that Calvin, Luther and others of the early reformers are not quoted nearly so often as are the more contemporary theologians, particularly Ames, the author of *The Marrow of Modern Divinity* and *Bellarminus Enervatus*, who appear repeatedly in the footnotes.

The editor comments in his introduction that Norton, in favouring open and frank discussion, provides a method and a spirit to be followed in the ecumenical movement of the present day. While this may be true in one sense, Norton's views not only on the nature of the autonomy of the "particular church," but also on the relative unimportance of ordination by the laying on of hands once election has taken place, would hardly seem to fit in with the twentieth century ecumenist's point of view. He would undoubtedly be very critical of the proposal to introduce bishops into the Church of Scotland. Thus the attempt to characterize it as a "gift to the ecumenical movement" seems to be an overstatement (p. xx).

Well translated and well produced, this book should be of great interest to anyone who is interested in the background and origins of the twentieth century Christian Church.

W. Stanford Reid

Dept. of History
McGill University
Montreal

The Reasonableness of Christianity, with *A Discourse of Miracles* and *A Third Letter Concerning Tradition*. By John Locke. Edited, abridged and introduced by I. T. Ramsey. London: Adam & Charles Black (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited), 1958. Pp. 102. $2.50.

The republication of this volume, first published in 1795, points to the fact that the problem of Reason and Revelation is still very much a live issue today, and the last word has yet to be written on the subject.

To understand Locke's argument, one must go back to his *Essay*, Book IV, chapter 17, and re-read the distinction he makes between "according to reason," "above reason," and "contrary to reason."

(1) *According to reason* are such propositions whose truth we can discover by examining and tracing those ideas we have from sensation and reflection, and by natural deduction find to be true or probable.
(2) *Above reason* are such propositions whose truth or probability we cannot by reason derive from those principles.
(3) *Contrary to reason* are such propositions as are inconsistent with or irreconcilable to our clear and distinct ideas. Thus the existence of one God is according to reason; the existence of more than one God is contrary to reason; the resurrection of the dead above reason.

By "above reason" Locke means faith, or the assent to any proposition that cannot be deduced by reason, but must be based upon some witness who claims to have this truth from God in some extraordinary way of communication. This type of communication he terms "revelation." Locke the empiricist has now become Locke the theologian.

These ideas are elaborated in the volume under review. Locke bases his argument for the reasonableness of Christianity upon the authority of Scriptures, an argument which is no longer acceptable by modern theologians.

He begins with the story of Adam's Fall from obedience, and proceeds to show that man in general subsequently continued to be in a state of disobedience. Something had to be done to restore man to his original state of obedience and righteousness. This God did by sending Jesus Christ into the world to restore man to God by dying upon the Cross. Locke lays great stress on the miracles performed by Jesus. While he does not regard them as wonder-working acts, he does regard them as pointers to the divinity of Christ. This makes Jesus the authentic witness to God's revelation.

The question is, Does Locke seriously think that he is proving anything? Does he not assume what he is trying to prove? If so, his argument is a *petitio principii*, and not proof positive that Christianity is reasonable.

Locke assumes that the witness of the Gospel and the miracles of Jesus are sufficient to prove that Christianity is reasonable. It is quite patent that Christianity is not as simple as some would make it out to be. It is also quite obvious to any intelligent person that Christianity is anything but reasonable in an empirical sense. If it cannot be proved empirically, why talk about "the reasonableness of Christianity?" There is nothing reasonable, for instance, about the fact that God became man, or that He died on the Cross, or that He rose again from the dead. It is doubtful whether such arguments would have been acceptable even in the seventeenth century, let alone in our age.

That does not mean that Christianity is absurd or untrue. What it does mean is that the arguments offered by Locke on behalf of the reasonableness of Christianity prove nothing. It is difficult to see what the editor sought to accomplish by republishing this volume.

Louis J. Shein

Hamilton, Ontario

KIERKEGAARD: Johannes Climacus or, *De Omnibus dubitandum est* and *A Sermon* translated, with an assessment. By T. H. CROXALL. London: Adam and Charles Black (Toronto: The Macmillan Co. of Canada), 1958. Pp. 196. $3.25.

THIS VOLUME offers, for the first time in English, two small works of Kierkegaard together with an extensive assessment of his work as a whole. The translator and author of the assessment is a scholar to whom students are already much indebted.

Of the two works, the *De Omnibus Dubitandum Est* is Kierkegaard's first full-blown attempt to challenge Hegel; and, while often unimpressive or even inept in form, it already seminally contains virtually all the later criticisms. If this makes the book an important work, it is because the Hegel-Kierkegaard controversy, a crucial event in the latter's development, has cast its spell over so much of contemporary thought. It is essential that contemporary thinkers should understand that controversy, instead of being merely its spell-bound victims.

The central issue may be said to lie in the question whether, and if so where and how, a limit may and must be set to the Hegelian attempt dialectically to relativize (or, more modernly put, to contextualize) all experience. Kierkegaard sets such limits wherever personality comes into play: its moral decisions, its responsibility for sin, its leap into faith. His main argument is that the *existing* thinker, with his passions, interests, agonizing conflicts, must of necessity fall outside his all-contextualizing system. This argument, proliferating in Kierkegaard himself and many others in a dozen impressive ways, has come to seem so powerful to some contemporaries—especially theologians—as to be virtually unanswerable. But a glance at contemporary psychological and sociological thought—not to mention Marxism—shows that the issue is not settled; and it gives rise to the suspicion that Hegel, were he alive, might charge Kierkegaard and his followers with arbitrariness, either in setting limits to contextualizing at all, or in setting them at the exact points at which they do. Hence those interested in truth, not merely in scoring theological debating points, must study, not merely Kierkegaard's case in the controversy, but Hegel's as well.

It is here that virtually all Kierkegaard's expositors let us down. This is no doubt in part due to the fact that he himself lets us down. In his case, however, there is an ample excuse, not to say an inner necessity. First, what original thinker ever *really* succeeded in entering the thought of another with which he disagreed? Secondly, Kierkegaard is, after all, the father of existential thought. As such, he can hardly confine himself to working out, against Hegel, the dialectical implications of the fact that the thinker, *qua* person, is interested; he must also put forward, against Hegel, his own personal interests and Hegel's failure to satisfy them. We cannot blame him for also doing the latter, although it is true that only the former enables him really to enter into the thought of his opponent. Just how badly he fails in this

respect when doing the latter is perhaps best illustrated by his comments on Schelling's "positive" philosophy. These add up to little more than the confession that Schelling does not satisfy his needs as an orthodox Christian. Since Schelling never made a claim to orthodoxy such criticisms do not shed much light.

But a failure which is excusable and possibly even inevitable in the case of Kierkegaard himself is altogether inexcusable in the case of his commentators. Whether because of misguided Kierkegaard-piety or lack of knowledge or both, most of these have presented Schelling and Hegel as madmen or fools, not as great philosophers. In this they have done Kierkegaard no service. For he appears merely as a man who restored ordinary sanity and good sense, whereas in fact he grappled with the most powerful philosophies of his time.

Croxall, otherwise a reliable and indeed excellent expositor, shares this general weakness concerning Kierkegaard's background. Suspicion is aroused by elementary errors: he makes a slip with the Christian name of one well-known philosopher (J. C. Fichte instead of J. G.), and on the last names of two others (Sterner instead of Stirner, and Freis instead of Fries). Errors of substance confirm the suspicion. Kierkegaard to the contrary notwithstanding, it is simply not true that Hegel begins with pure being, pure nothing and pure thought as "one mad postulate" (p. 67). He begins in this way in his *Logic* only after having led up to it through over 700 pages of his *Phenomenology*. With reservations, we may say (using Thomistic language) that the beginning *per se* in the *Logic* is prepared by a beginning *quoad nos* in the *Phenomenology*. Now Kierkegaard in his *De Omnibus Dubitandum Est* never quite manages to understand Hegel here, and this makes a good deal of his criticism pointless. Still, one may excuse Kierkegaard for this, for the Hegelian doctrine is admittedly difficult. But one cannot excuse Croxall for sharing the confusion, for Hegel scholarship has long since cleared it up. Nor is this his only serious error. He shares the common misconception, spread by Marxists, logical positivists and incompetent histories of philosophy, that Hegel's "reason" is the abstract intellect: a view which reduces his teaching to nonsense. And of what Schelling meant by positive philosophy he seems to have but the vaguest notion.

Possibly it is not wholly fair, in a review of a good book on Kierkegaard by a good Kierkegaard scholar, to concentrate on the latter's shortcomings as regards Hegel and Schelling. This was done, however, on behalf of Kierkegaard and on behalf of his legacy. If Kierkegaard scholars go on much longer not taking the philosophies with which he grappled seriously, they will end up not taking his grappling seriously, either. They will then still be left with Kierkegaard the impressive preacher, and Kierkegaard the impressive religious psychologist. But they will have lost Kierkegaard the outstanding and indeed unique religious thinker.

Emil L. Fackenheim

University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario

The Kingdom of Christ, or Hints To A Quaker Respecting The Principles, Constitution and Ordinances Of The Catholic Church. By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, newly edited by ALEC R. VIDLER. London: S.C.M. Press (Toronto: Ryerson), 1958. Two volumes. Pp. 288, 371. $6.00.

MAURICE stands apart from those nineteenth-century movements in the Church of England which caused most stir at the time. While not an Anglo-Catholic, he is a fruitful source for understanding the nature of the Catholic Church, a source increasingly resorted to by Anglo-Catholics of the twentieth century. While not an Evangelical, he penetrates Evangelical thinking and formulates the pre-eminent role of faith in a manner readily understandable by both Evangelicals and their less enthusiastic brethren alike. He is commonly associated with the "Broad Church" movement, but he is scarcely a modernist. He is perhaps in the Platonist tradition of English religious thought.

Maurice's method may strike the modern reader as rather scholastic. He proceeds by means of a description of a doctrine, or a system, as understood by those who held it. He then moves to the characteristic objections to that doctrine, or system, which are made by those who hold others. The third step is not so much synthesis as a careful placing of the thesis and antithesis in perspective, a perspective from the point of view of the ends which these serve and the scriptural and historical facts to which they correspond. Maurice is always careful to see in any aberrations from total truth a characteristic, if isolated and incomplete, good. The whole and complete structure to which all these spectral "Goods" fit is the Church of England as a system and as the embodiment of formularies.

Lest we should think that Maurice is a phlegmatic English version of Hegel, who searched heaven and earth to bolster the Prussian State, we must understand that he examines the English Church itself with a keen knife. The work is not simply a contribution to the theology of the Mystical Body; it is also the work of apologetic which is concerned to show the nature of the Mystical Body—its "Principles, Constitution and Ordinances"—by examination of the strengths and weaknesses of all bodies which have identified themselves with the Mystical Body. For Maurice, the Anglican Church provides a more comprehensive order of strength along with a characteristic collection of weaknesses.

The *Kingdom of Christ*, then, is not just an apologetic for internal, Anglican consumption, but is directed outwards to the critique of non-Anglican systems: the Quakers, as representing what by 1958 might be called the Pentecostal experiment; Pure Protestantism; Unitarianism, at that time a system which did involve a belief in an actual God; and the religious, philosophical and political movements of the age of the Enlightenment and of the French Revolution. In his second part he compares the "Romish" system with the Catholic Church for the signs of whose spiritual constitution he looks exhaustively. These signs he enumerates as Baptism, the Creeds, Worship and the Eucharist, the Ministry and the Scriptures—a pre-

formulation of the Lambeth Quadrilateral many years ahead of Lambeth. The comfort which this book will afford to the Anglican is not the kind that will assure him of his own superiority, but rather that will move him closer to the genuine principles of his Church and, at the same time, enable him to see that certain of these are already held—perhaps more closely—outside that Church. Maurice's principles and method would seem to have been justified by one hundred years of history. Discussions similar to his own now take place in the Student Christian Movement and in the Faith and Order Conference of the World Council of Churches. In an age when none of these existed—but rather, hatred, suspicion and disdain—Maurice was an eirenic pioneer. His work is accorded honour by many outside Anglicanism, by men such as Principal David Cairns and Père Louis Boyer. The S.C.M. Press is to be commended for republishing this book, which is one among many important works by Maurice, and which has been called for repeatedly by students since the Everyman Edition went out of print before the war.

GRAHAM COTTER

Diocesan Council for Social Service
Toronto

Platonism in Recent Religious Thought. By W. D. GEOGHEGAN. New York: Columbia University Press (Toronto: Oxford University Press), 1958. Pp. vi, 200. $4.25.

THIS BOOK is a comparative study of Platonism in the religious thought of six authors: W. R. Inge, Paul Elmer More, A. E. Taylor, William Temple, A. N. Whitehead and George Santayana. Its object is to show the relevance of Platonism, both in its classical and traditional forms, to contemporary religious problems, and to consider how far the authors discussed genuinely represent Platonism. In addition the book aims to exhibit the development of Platonic elements within the thought of each author, and to consider each author's position, *qua* Platonist in relation to the others.

Professor Geoghegan's conclusions are reached in a final chapter. The authors he discusses do not, in his view, present either Platonism or the Christian faith adequately. The connection between Christianity and Platonism is established only at the cost of distorting each of them. There are essential incompatibilities that render any assimilation of them bound to fail. The six main chapters of the book are largely concerned to illustrate the different aspects of this failure that emerge in the authors discussed. Each chapter contains a brief resumé of the author's life and writings; an account of his interpretation of Platonism; some criticisms of this interpretation; an exposition of his own religious thought; and a section of critical conclusions.

A comparison on these lines between such distinct and distinguished thinkers is a project likely to be of much interest to students of Plato. Moreover, the general thesis that Christianity and Platonism cannot be

fused without some cost to each of them will command a wide measure of assent. Professor Geoghegan's concluding chapter contains some valuable remarks in summary of the affinities between Christianity and Platonism and of the essential differences between them, including the religious short-comings of "proofs" of God's existence (pp. 169–172).

It is doubtful, however, whether the detailed studies of his six authors support his conclusion, and how far they actually achieve the variety of aims stated in the introduction (pp. 2–4). In particular, the question of the relevance of Platonism today (p. 2) and the related question, "What may Platonism become?" (p. 4), do not seem anywhere to receive a clear answer. This is especially unfortunate as some of the authors are severely criticised for not bringing Platonism to bear on contemporary man's religious problems (pp. 33, 55, 81).

An initial distinction is drawn between classical, traditional and contemporary Platonism, but it is not kept in view throughout the book as a whole. Thus Santayana is criticised for treating the ideal theory as the essence of Platonism, on the ground that Plotinus held that the "intelligible world is not outside mind" (p. 146). The problem of the relations between classical, traditional and contemporary Platonism is not, indeed, posed in terms that augur any happy solution: "The question arises whether classical, traditional and contemporary Platonism are mutually compatible, incompatible, or partly both at the same time."

The most serious need, however, is for elucidation of the various interpretations of Plato ascribed to the six authors and for the grounding of these interpretations in the original text of Plato. The reader constantly finds himself asking why these authors should have interpreted Plato as they did. On what grounds, for example, did Santayana ascribe to Socrates a "logic of the autonomous will" and "a metaphysical side to his thought which consisted of an hypostatis of words and moral concepts into cosmic powers" (p. 141). It would be especially interesting to know, since Santayana is said to be free of the heresy of confusing Socrates with Plato (p. 146). What again, is meant my More's view that Socrates rejected the immanent mechanical conception of *telos*" (p. 36), and what grounds does *Phaedo* 96ff. provide for this? Why does More hold that in Plato's view the identification of virtue and knowledge cannot be demonstrated by philosophy, or that his scientific interests ousted the ethical dialectic (pp. 38–9)? If this is true, what are we to make of the *Philebus?*

Professor Geoghegan's critical discussions of his authors do not illuminate such questions. He has a short way with interpretations or views that he regards as unsound. They are dismissed as "uncritical," "inaccurate," "incomplete," "superficial," "arbitrary," "erroneous" or "obscurantistic" (*sic* p. 53). He is not himself free from the faults of "loose vituperation" which he imputes to More (p. 51). Some of his assessments are in sweeping, almost offensive terms—for example, his final appraisal of Inge (p. 55), and his condescending comparison of Taylor and Temple in their treatments of the *Republic* (p. 90). In a particularly irritating passage (p. 81),

Taylor is castigated for his "antiquarianism and his lack of originality" — unjustly, for Taylor constantly strove to give Plato's thought a meaning in terms of contemporary philosophical issues.

As for "antiquarianism," Professor Geoghegan makes constant use of Greek and Latin phrases throughout his book. Sometimes these are gratuitous; for example, "he (sc. Whitehead) holds that the ultimate problem of metaphysics is the conception of a complete or, as Plato puts it, *panteles* fact" (p. 112). Sometimes they are not even correct. "*Paradeigma*" appears as if it were a plural form (pp. 21, 44, 135). On page 23, mention is made of "the Christian dogma that man is created *in imago Dei*."

D. GALLOP

Dept. of Ethics
University College
University of Toronto

The State and the Church in a Free Society. By A. VICTOR MURRAY. Cambridge: The University Press (Toronto: the Macmillan Co. of Canada). 1958. Pp. xiii, 191. $4.50.

THE DEFINITIVE work on the relations of church and state has not yet been written; nor does Dr. A. Victor Murray, the Hibbert lecturer of 1957, make any claim to finality. In point of fact the underlying theme of his lectures is that the relations of church and state must be continually in flux and in constant need of readjustment and restatement; consequently, there is a bright future for the writing of books on church and state.

It is a rather hackneyed subject but our author has succeeded in introducing a novel aspect to the discussion. The responsibility for education is a time honoured topic when dealing with the relations of church and state. The novelty of Dr. Murray's approach to this topic is a long discussion on the question of curricula which includes such items as: "Should a well-known boarding school for girls have carpentry as one of its subjects?" Again, novelty is evident in the treatment of marriage and divorce, since it includes a long exegesis on the Biblical view of marriage, coupled with a strong polemic against believing that Jesus really took such a rigid attitude towards divorce as implied in Mark 10:6. It is inconceivable to Dr. Murray that Jesus' teaching about marriage and divorce should differ so markedly from his usual attitude "that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." After considerable examination of Biblical texts and Rabbinical literature, Dr. Murray comes to the opinion that Jesus was not trying to impose a rigid rule but was trying to protect women from the harshness of Jewish law.

There is reason for preoccupation with these familial problems, since Dr. Murray's concern is with the new relationship of secular and spiritual that has arisen since the emergence of the welfare state as well as the earlier emergence of denominational Christianity. In this new era Government now "exists for the maintenance of society rather than for a balancing of claims."

The Church which once challenged the full fury of Caesar can in its denominational framework be now no more than a voluntary society which co-operates with other voluntary societies in the maintenance of the good society. After a long sojourn through the internal tensions of the churches, such as the high and low church controversy within Anglicanism, or the Free Church grievance against the lack of fraternity of the established church, we are told that the church in its relation to the state represents more than a collection of denominational interests; that somehow there is in reality an ideal church community which is a standing challenge to each institutional church and to the state itself.

With considerable vehemence Dr. Murray makes it clear that he is not offering any blue-print for the good society. He abhors all Rousseauian or Marxian utopias, and he even rebukes Emil Brunner for dividing his work *Justice and the Social Order* "into two parts, first principles and second practice—as if the working of human relationships could first of all be brought out into solitude and then brought down into the market place and applied to the varied throbbing life of the world." Canon Demant receives a similar rebuke for beginning *Theology of Society* "at the metaphysical end as far as possible away from the people whom he is supposed to be talking about."

One feels that the author has a strong case here, but it seems somewhat undermined by his own advocacy of the ideal church community. The success of his own scheme for the creation of the good or relatively satisfactory society is that it depends upon the leadership of rational men of good-will in both church and state. We do not always, even in a free society, get such leadership. It would seem that Dr. Murray's ideal community runs all the hazards of Marx's utopia or Brunner's principles or Demant's metaphysics. Nevertheless the author has some excellent suggestions as to the Church's task in the world, that are well worth pondering. It may be added that he has a homely, pithy style that makes his work very easy reading.

H. H. Walsh

McGill University
Montreal, P.Q.

Communism and the Theologians, Study of an Encounter. By Charles C. West. London: S.C.M. Press (Toronto: Ryerson Press), 1958. Pp. 399. $7.00.

No student of the great theologians of our day, or of Christian Social Ethics, can afford to overlook this book. It is a "study in depth." The author really grapples with the theologians concerned, making an honest effort to appreciate the background, development and total content of their writings in order to find their relevance for Communism. He does not take the easy way out of simply trying to extract seemingly relevant statements with regard to Communism. Occasionally his analysis seems to be unduly long but on the whole his appraisals are very fair. West seeks to meet the concrete need

"of Christians who cannot escape the fact of Communism in their daily lives, and the need of other Christians who are tempted, because the Communists are so far away, to oversimplify and to forget it" (p. 17). He says: "In the centre of this work we seek to place no theory or analysis, but the living response of Christians to the living force of Communism in the present-day world, as it is illuminated by the theologies which have had most to do with this response" (p. 17). Fortunately, the book is not just another analysis, or another Christian "answer" to Communism. It succeeds in placing squarely before the Christian the question: Am I following the living Truth in Christ or an ideology of my own?

The main study includes an examination of the theologies of Brunner, Hromadka, Tillich, Berdyaev, Reinhold Niebuhr and Barth.

Brunner is described as one "who has not felt the impact of that fundamental doubt about human capacity to express social truth free of social interest, which a full encounter with Marx's doctrine of ideology arouses" (p. 38). "The real problems of society are always falling outside Brunner's conceptual analysis" (p. 39). "In short we have here (in Brunner) a typical example of conservative idealism, peculiarly open to all the Marxist charges that it fails to understand and change reality in a largely socially determined world, and helpless before the vigour of Communist power to build new societies in the strength of a future hope" (p. 40).

The weakness of Hromadka is that "he evokes an image of the Communist movement which identifies it with a kind of ideal moral-historical force of his own definition, rather than with the reality, either of the proletarian revolution, or of the Marx-Leninist Communist Party" (p. 62). Hromadka can be optimistic because he ignores the problem of power in a totalitarian state. In Hromadka we have "a longing for a *kulturchristliche* unity of religion with social power" (p. 77).

The trouble with Tillich is that he never quite comes to grips with the kind of revolution which Communism is. "The Being which Tillich posited, as underlying both Marxism and religious socialism, and as realizing itself in the proletarian situation toward a new theonomy, was an illusion, and not real existence. It was an *a priori* of Tillich's mind . . ." (p. 110). Tillich remains "enclosed in his own ontological system" and is closed "to the human realities of Communism when they fall outside this system" (p. 111).

It was Berdyaev who first understood and expounded Marxism and Communism as a religious movement and the first "to express the insights which inform the most effective Christian witness behind the Iron Curtain today" (p. 116).

Chapter 4 on Reinhold Niebuhr is rather long. West pays tribute to Niebuhr for not allowing himself, as the other theologians do, to escape the burdens, tensions, anxieties and relative decisions of this world in some theological or churchly way. The great thing about Niebuhr is his realism about the world which he insists must be the starting point for any effective Christian action. However, Niebuhr, the-Christian-in-the-world, lacks the joyful abandon of Barth and really begins from somewhere in history

rather than from Christ's relation to the redeemed man. Of the six theologians studied in the book, Niebuhr "is the sharpest analyst of world Communist power and of Christian responsibility in the face of it" (p. 158). Even so, Niebuhr "has never been placed in the position where the whole meaning and direction of his life and his society were called in question by a great new ideological power" (p. 167). "It is hard for all believers in Niebuhr's type of Christian action of a pragmatic sort, to understand that their 'realism', transported out of an Anglo-Saxon environment sounds to others like ideology" (p. 168). "It justifies so much of the Anglo-Saxon way of life that it builds up the authority of the white man" (p. 169). "For Christians confronted with Communists as neighbours, Niebuhr is of surprisingly little help."

By far the longest treatment is given to Barth (Chaps. 5–6). "No one of the theologians with whom we deal in this study, gives as adequate a Christian answer to the intellectual problem raised by the Marxist doctrine of ideology, as does Barth" (p. 216). Even so, we find "confusion and ineptitude in Barth's theology of politics, where he faces the difficult decisions which Christians must make in crisis situations" (p. 287). It is true that Barth has done more "than any other theologian in the tradition of the Reformation to open the way for a Christian dynamic in political life" and that he "provided the theological elements of the encounter . . .: the elements of Christological understanding of the state, a free direct approach to human beings and their welfare, and knowledge of the crisis of Christian obedience in the political sphere" (p. 304). Praise of Barth's value in the encounter with Communism is mingled with comments like: "Barth after all was able to remain a theoretical proletarian, fighting a sweeping theological revolution when all the while the solid ground of Swiss tradition remained under his feet" (p. 353). Barth is accused of "over-simplification" of the political issues and "blindness" to some of the factors involved and is "strangely insensitive" to the world in practice. He "fails completely to measure the force of Communist ideological pressure through schools, mass organizations, training camps and the like . . ." (p. 321). He "neglects the temptations and struggles of real people" and "talks past them." "In this area of human life Barth remains . . . something of a stranger." West suggests that in Bonhoeffer we find a kind of combination of "the adequacy of Niebuhr and Barth" (p. 343).

The last chapter has helpful suggestions and observations regarding Christian action in the face of Communism, and stresses again that we must not retreat into nor merely point to an ideology or system of truth but that our task is that of obedient participation in God's concern for our neighbour each day and year. Only "realistic concern" for the neighbour, at cost to oneself, can "convince the unbeliever that the Lord and guide of the journey is the servant of God who bore the Cross" (p. 387).

Donald V. Wade

Knox College
Toronto

Christian Science Today: Power, Policy, Practice. By CHARLES S. BRADEN. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1958. Pp. xvi, 432. $5.95.

ANYONE desiring to have between two covers whatever is worth knowing about Christian Science, should welcome this book. It marshals the facts, digging into sources to become an encyclopedia of the cult's external and internal history. Conflicts without, tensions and dissensions within at high and low levels, successes and dubious strategies and claims, are all uncovered. The narrative is candid and is clearly told.

It is when the reader looks beyond narration and record to the writer's criticism, that disappointment enters. One could say there is no essential critique. The author will be nothing if not objective, save that he states his own religious belief and owns the constraint of it. Other than this he bends backward in giving the data and leaving judgment to the reader; so that his hints at evaluation, being parts of no total verdict, have a disconnection that leaves one wondering whether he is friendly to Christian Science or not.

The whole book serves to illustrate this. At the end the author writes of himself as we have just written of him; he is "neither prophet nor son of a prophet, but only a reporter of what he has observed . . ." (p. 401). But he then completes the sentence: "in the life of the *great* Christian Science movement since the death of its *great* founder" (italics ours). This in the last paragraph of the book is more than the reader is prepared for from its general tenor; its author does not portray Mary Baker Eddy throughout as one of the "great" figures of Christian history, nor Christian Science as one of its "great" epochs. One who could justify her plagiarism on the ground that Divine Truth so came through her that her signature meant, "This is from God," whence what she took from others became hers as the human instrument of the new character and credential thereby obtained for it (pp. 211, 2), hardly answers to "greatness" in the Church's scroll. Hence, then, the incoherence of our author's appraisals: a final and general estimate which his particular characterizations, even arranged cumulatively, fail to warrant. Nevertheless, he has produced a valuable book—one which as a storehouse of materials and factual knowledge annotated and authenticated from documents, and clarified in their importance for a just understanding of Christian Science, is not likely soon to be surpassed.

J. LINE

Emmanuel College
Toronto, Ont.

Religion, Society and the Individual. By J. M. YINGER. New York: The Macmillan Company (Toronto: Brett-Macmillan), 1957. Pp. xvi, 655. $5.00.

IN THIS volume the author attempts to provide two things: an introduction to the sociology of religion, and a companion set of readings comprising some

of the now classical items in the literature of this field. His goal is to provide an analysis of religion in the context of society in general. He is not content to consider religions as they appear in specific small societies (as described by social anthropologists), nor to limit himself to the individual denominations found in a larger society. His intent is nothing less than a study of the functions served by religion in the total ongoing life of society; he hopes to state propositions that can be tested by further study of specific religions in specific societies.

The approach of the author is the conventional three-pronged attack found in many sociology texts. He traces the relation of religion to personality development, to culture, and to social organization. Culture in this context refers specifically to magic, morals, and science. Social organization comprises political institutions, economic institutions, and the classes and castes found in modern complex societies. A final section is concerned with religion and social change.

In a sense the shortcomings and successes of the book mirror the achievements of sociology in these various areas. The materials from anthropological writings are pithy and exciting. Similarly, the materials describing religion among the lively sects, and the descriptions of the varied practices found among different social classes, make rewarding reading. At the points at which sociology has had least success to date (explaining social change, and providing a total picture of social life in the immense, urbanized, industrialized, nationalistic societies of our own time) the analysis of religion becomes correspondingly vague and unsatisfying to the reviewer.

The book will probably become a useful text for students in courses in the Sociology of Religion. These students, and readers in general, will be grateful for an introduction to some of the most acute observers of social life. The author's modesty, and his humble approach to a gigantic task, combine with an attractive writing style to provide a scholarly, humanistic volume.

O. HALL

Dept. of Sociology
University of Toronto
Toronto

Pastoral Counselling For Mental Health. By SAMUEL R. LAYCOCK. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1958. Pp. 94. $1.00.

THIS PAPER-COVERED BOOK has eleven chapters on counselling, starting with the clergyman's role in counselling, and goes on to such subjects as marriage counselling, counselling alcoholics and counselling in family problems. There is quite an extensive reference-list appended to each chapter. Perhaps the intention of the writer is revealed in these references, for the book is not a treatment of the subject, only a mapping of the ground.

That clergy and rabbis are all too inadequately equipped to deal with the problems of individuals in this complex and confused society must be conceded. As the medical doctor and the psychiatrist are specialists, so too is the

clergyman. Best results are obtained when all three work together, and each knows the limits of his own profession. The one who counsels in the name of the Church should put himself in possession of the best psychological insights and match them with deep religious understanding. Professor Laycock is familiar with all this (p. 15) but he sadly underestimates the Cleric's unique and distinctive contribution: "The clergyman's role is to help the relatives to seek competent advice and then to help them to act on such advice" (p. 59); "the minister should summon to his aid whatever family welfare agencies are available." (p. 60). I recommend the book to beginners, and would feel happier if the title read "Preface to Pastoral Counselling."

FRANK LAWSON

Halifax, N.S.

Why Baptize Infants? By H. HUTCHISON. New York: Greenwich Book Publishers, 1957. Pp. 85. $2.50.

HERE IS a slender volume which deals with a weighty matter. It is intended to "explain the ancient Christian practice of infant baptism . . . for the layman."

Of cardinal importance in the whole presentation is the doctrine of the covenant of grace. Dr. Hutchison affirms that "it is no exaggeration to say that every doctrine of the Christian Faith is shaped by it" (p. 11). The covenant is regarded as "the master-key to an understanding of God's ways with men" (p. 12). The new dispensation is seen as resting upon the old and as being explained by the old. The people of God is one people, whether in the Old Testament or in the New. What circumcision signified in former times, baptism means now.

While recognizing the place of individual, personal decision, Dr. Hutchison also stresses "spiritual solidarity" and the need of Christian nurture for confirmation of covenant children in the Faith. His treatment of the implications of the covenant for Christian education and evangelism is suggestive and would repay detailed development.

In dealing with the various objections to infant baptism and disposing of the customary misunderstandings surrounding the practice, the author quotes often from Luther, Calvin, Barth and Cullman. Occasionally there are errors in the Scripture references. And in one place mention is made (intentionally or otherwise) of "the Earthly Fathers of the Church" (p. 30). But whatever typographical errors may be in the book, they do not detract from the readability and reliability of the work as a whole. The average layman may not find this volume as easy to read as a paper-back novel, but all laymen and ministers interested in the matter of infant baptism will benefit from a consideration of Dr. Hutchison's presentation.

MARIANO DI GANGI

Hamilton, Ontario.